NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10¢

Royal Oak, Michigan July 21, 1941 Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year

BRITAIN WANTS U. S. EXPEDITIONARY FORCE

(See Page 3)

Allied Strategists Planning Military Invasion of Europe

(Story on Page 9)

Christianity Under a 'Controlled' Democracy

(See Page 12)

Communist 'Daily Worker' Praises Bishop Hurley

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ BIOGRAPHY OF NEW RED PROPAGANDIST ★ STILL TIME TO ENTER JUBILEE CONTEST

Dinner Chat

Dissertation on 'Prominent Catholics'

WITH what we would describe as monotonous regularity newspapers of late have been printing statements of "prominent Catholics" urging the United States either to enter the war formally or to take further steps which inevitably will lead to our participation in war.

A New Yorker, writing in the Readers' Forum of the *Daily Tribune* of Dubuque, Iowa, apparently has these "prominent Catholics" in mind when he observes:

"The *New York Times* prints an appeal from 15 'prominent Catholics' to President Roosevelt to side with Russia.

"There are good Catholics, bad Catholics, practicing Catholics, devout Catholics, and 'prominent Catholics.' The most difficult of these to recognize is the 'prominent Catholic.'

"In 'prominent Catholic,' the adjective cancels out the noun, as in 'German silver,' 'fool's gold,' and 'Hell's angels.'

"When you read of a 'prominent Catholic' you may envision a pillar of the Church. But oh, how wrong you are! The function of the 'prominent Catholic' is that of Samson in the temple. He pulls down the pillars.

"The priest made him a Catholic at baptism. The newspapers made him a 'prominent Catholic' when he lent his name to some scheme which Catholics oppose.

"He is rarely seen in Church, and is never connected with a Catholic activity unless there is an assurance of wide publicity.

"He has forgotten more about Catholic doctrine than the popes ever knew, and he can advise Catholics on their civic duties where the bishops fear to tread.

"A good working list of anti-Catholic projects could be furnished by the newspaper articles which feature 'prominent Catholics.'

"You can easily become a 'prominent Catholic' by writing to certain newspapers in favor of any measure hurtful to Christianity. Mention that you are a Catholic, and you will be heralded as a 'prominent Catholic.'

"The Lord may have had 'prominent Catholics' in mind when He said, 'A man's enemies shall be those of his own household'."

A Protestant's Reaction to Bishop Hurley's Speech

"Thank God for Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE," writes a Detroit woman who emphasizes she is not a Catholic, but feels justified in criticizing Bishop Hurley of St. Augustine for his recent pro-war appeal.

"Bishop Hurley has sounded the war drums," she continues. "He even has the nerve to suggest that we give up our democratic form of government and make F.D.R. a dictator.

"We Americans have enjoyed our form of government for 165 years and no priest has any right to suggest that we destroy it.

"Bishop Hurley says that we would be helping Christianity by pursuing the course he outlines. I never knew that the Catholic Church upheld the Russian Government. Neither did I know it is a Christian act to kill.

"My bible says, 'Thou shalt not kill.'

* * *

"It's pretty hard for a person to believe in God and religion when a man who is supposed to be trying to save souls has the nerve to stand up and oppose the good things in this world.

"If that's religion, then the men who preach it are no better than Stalin in Red Russia.

"Big tears of sympathy were shed by the 'upper crust' in our country when the small 'democracies' were invaded. But when God-hating, Church-burning Stalin and his country are invaded, the 'upper crust' and some of our Catholic priests are blowing the horns of war.

* * *

"We American people demand that our Congress stay on the job. We want no changes in our form of government, either by Bishop Hurley or by the Union Now crowd.

"Need we have a civil war in our own country to preserve what we have left?"

Marriage of the Lion and the Bear

ALTHOUGH verse is somewhat out of our line, we think the following contribution by a St. Louis reader rings the bell:

Is there going to be a marriage of the Lion and the Bear?
If there is, one thing is certain—Miss Columbia won't be there.
Oh, the bride may look so charming in her wedding robe of red,
And the groom so very kindly with a crown upon his head.
Will the blushing bride walk up the aisle with a prayer-book in her hand?
Or will she wear a garland red, symbolic of her land?

* * *

All the world will be atwitter on this gala wedding day;
Will Joe be there in person to give the bride away?
Will John Bull take some time out from his age-old game of war
To bestow a kiss upon the bride in memory of the Czar?
Of course, there'll be a preacher, and when the groom responds 'I will,'
I'm sure the saints will tremble and 'twill make the whole Church ill.

* * *

Will Benito be invited? Will Quisling be there, too?
Will China scatter wedding rice? Will Czecho toss the shoe?
And, up above, the skies so blue, with sun or moonlight lit,
Shall we see the jilted lover in a trusty Messerschmidt?
Perhaps he'll drop some orchids down upon the winsome lass
Or maybe just a friendly bomb with a whiff of poison gas.
What gift will Uncle Sam send this newly wedded pair?
We hope he'll use his noggin, and give them both the air.

PeteWants to Know What's Wrong With His Spelling

HELLO, FOLKS:

Well, I thought f'r a while I might hafta slide in t' see y' on a bolt uv lightnin' th' way things looked f'r a while t'day. We shure 've had our share uv rain with all th' sound effekts 'n lightning this week 'n I don't mind tellin' y', I was skared by some uv it. I got myself kurled up in a korner uv th' garage 'n stayed there with my hed all kovered up 'n shivered 'n shook 'n felt awful lonly-like, but finully th' fireworks stopt 'n th' sun broke thru th' klouds 'n I got brave again 'n skipt right down th' street t' th' offus f'r my chat with you.

I finully kornered my steddy gal 'n got her t' take down what I hafta say. She wasn't keen on it, but I gave her th' eye 'n she c'd see that I was tired uv bein' pusht around from one t' th' other so she kammed down 'n behaved herself. I guess y' gotta get tuff with girls once in a while, eh, fellas? Y' can't let 'em think they're gettin' away with ennythin' 'r y're sunk f'r shure.

My sekratary said she wouldn't mind takin' my diktashun so much if she didn't find that she wuz beginnin' t' talk like I do—'n—this seemed t' be bad—spellin' like I do. Now howd'y like that? What's wrong with th' way I spell, I'd like t' know? Ev'rybuddy seems t' be abul t' reed my writin' 'n unerstand my spellin', don't they? I haven't herd enny komplaints so far—'ceptin' from her—. She ses I spell jus' like werds sound, 'n that isn't korekt. Well, I kan't see enny sense in puttin' in a lot uv letters t' make werds all komplikated 'n I wouldn't be s'prized if one uv these days they'd fix it so ev'rybuddy'd be spellin' jus' like me.

* * *

Well, I guess I'll talk 'bout somethin' else f'r a spell—heh, heh, how's that? Pretty awful—I guess, judgin' from th' look I• jus, got from th' help here. Golly, jus, bekuz th' p'leece wer'e handin' out tikuts th' other ev'nun—'n not t' th' p'leecemen's ball, either — th' sekratary persun needn't be in such a mood. I'll be nice 'n not tell why she got that littul slip uv paper—maybe that'll help.

Well inta ev'ry life some rain mus' fall, it seems. Poor Daddy Schwartz had his share uv trubbul 'n sorrow this pas' week. I don't know if I menshuned las' time I saw y' 'bout his aged mother fallin' down 'n brakin' her hip—but she did 'n what with th' heet 'n th' shock 'n her age all put t'gether, she jus' couldn't hold onta life enny longer. She'd done a pretty good job uv hangin' onta it, though, havin' seen some ninety years come 'n go, 'n I guess th' Lord thought it was about time she left Elkhart, Indiana 'n came 't live with Him. I guess He thought He'd let her stay down here long enuf so He klosed her book uv life 'n took her t' th' land uv joy and rest.

We all sent our 'spresshuns uv simputhy t' Daddy Schwartz, that wux all we c'd do. It seems that at times like that there isn't much a body c'n do, is there? He's an only child, too, 'n that makes losin' a loved one so much harder, I think.

I wouldn't be a bit s'prized but what I autta go now, folks. It looks like it's klowdin' up again 'n I'd better hit th' trail f'r th' garage again. 'Fore I go, though, I wanna say thank y' f'r bein' so swell 'bout those subskripshuns—they've been komin' in very nicely—'n I hope y'll keep them comin' in a nice, steddy stream.

Well, s'long, now. I'll be seein' y' again.

—Pete.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just living annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of Government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly. Copyrighted 1941 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 8 July 21, 1941 No. 3

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date_____

Name_____

Address_____ City_____

State_____ Subscription rate $3 a year Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Comment

Those Brave Britons

BRITAIN'S history is notorious. She always succeeded in getting somebody else to do the dying for her.

She always succeeded in getting somebody else to win the victories for her.

One must hand it to the British because, in every instance, since the days of Virgin Bess (and Sir Walter Raleigh) her statesmen have been able to out-maneuver all other statesmen including His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States.

At the beginning of the World War Britain wanted our moral support — just our moral support.

How good it would be to know that the strong right arm of Uncle Sam was raised in benediction over the imperial flag of St. George!

After a month of disaster, Britain would be satisfied if we would send over a few cannon — obsolete cannon, if you please.

Several months later, she would be satisfied if we sent over some obsolete destroyers — still obsolete, if you please.

A few months later, she would be satisfied if we passed a Lend-Lease bill mortgaging our wealth, our rights, our liberties — not to mention our airplanes and battleships.

And still a few months later, the inimitable Englishmen wanted us to take over the guardianship of the Atlantic where the final battle was being fought.

Just that — and nothing more.

And now comes the finale.

It is ably expressed by the *Chicago Daily Tribune* in an editorial entitled "Cannon Fodder" (July 10).

Britain wants just one more favor — one, mind you. Here it is, with the *Tribune's* comment:

Gen. Sir Claude Auchinleck, the new commander in chief of the British army in the middle east, says that American man power will be needed if the war is to be won "properly."

"I've always thought the war must be won in Europe," he told correspondents in Cairo, "in Germany, on Germany's own soil. Therefore I see as much need for American man power in this war as in the last." Gen. Sir Archibald P. Wavell, whom Gen. Sir Claude succeeded, was of the same opinion. Neither has fought on Germany's own soil. No British land force has been close to it and none has been on it as the war rounds out its second year. American man power is to break into it and storm Berlin.

The British generals talk of American man power and mean cannon fodder. Man power is a gentler word. The British are waiting until the youth of this country, millions of young men, have been conscripted into military service, and trained or untrained, can be carried across seas to be thrown in masses against the German war machine to be blown to bits, to fight their way into Berlin and revenge the defeats in Norway, Flanders, Greece, Crete, and Libya.

The British people have been taught to expect this. The British generals demand it. They are presenting an overdue note signed by the cannon fodder traffickers of this country. It is natural for British generals who have fought their wars with other peoples' soldiers to have these ideas and make such requisitions. It is not so natural that American society women who collect bundles for Britain should have the same feeling regarding the youth of their country. It is not so natural for war committees, the Aid the Allies, the Fight for Freedom, the Friends of China, and the Union Now, to echo the demands of the British generals.

But all these people are willing, even anxious, to immolate the young men of America on the battlefields of the whole world and to do it now.

War Committee Changes Name

THE organization once known as "The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies" has changed its name.

Henceforth, it will be known by "Committee to Defend America."

One does not need to look into a dictionary for a definition of the word "defend."

Index to Comment

Those Brave Britons; War Committee Changes Name; The End of Freedom Page 3

Westbrook Pegler; Prof. Fisher on Debt, Money, Booms and Depressions Page 4

Time Magazine on Bishop Hurley; Reds' Daily Worker Praises Bishop; A Catholic Dissents Page 5

Editorials: Economic Parity with Canada; Noisy Minority—The War-Mongers; A Jesuit Editorial Page 6

Our Communist Allies; The New France Page 7

Behind the War: England and U. S. May Try Invasion of Europe; Radical Refugees Entering America Page 8

The Return of Litvinov, Godless Revolutionary Page 9

Biography of New Red Propagandist; What to Do With Your Money; Revelry by Night Page 11

Reforms Fail Under a 'Controlled' Democracy Page 12

Continue Supporting Wheeler, Lindbergh; 'Machivelli-and-Soda' Page 13

Los Angeles Out for Britain Now; The Panacea Crop Page 16

Those Polls of Public Opinion Page 17

Sabath Sows Seeds for Stalin's Soviet; How 'Democratic' Is Union Now? Page 18

More of 'Justice Now'; A Letter to Fr. Coughlin Page 19

Definitions of words are what those in power want to make of them.

Thus, full page advertisements, paid for by the Committee to Defend America, appeared in many papers throughout the nation, July 3.

Under the caption "Okay, Mr. President, Go Ahead and Clear the Atlantic," the Committee says, "The American people know we are 'at war' with Hitler. They know the difference between an undeclared war and a declared war."

Swiftly following this propaganda job, Mr. Roosevelt occupied Iceland and put American ships into a position to be sunk, according to international law, by Nazi submarines.

The front men for the Committee to Defend America are unimportant in every sense but one. The only sense in which they are important is that they know who the real war-mongers are. Following the war these "fronts" should be apprehended and forced to disclose the identity of their backers.

The principal "fronters" are Ernest W. Gibson, Jr., National Chairman; Lewis W. Douglas, Chairman, National Board; Clark M. Eichelberger, National Director and Acting Chairman; Henry A. Atkinson, Barry Bingham, William Emerson, Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., Frank P. Graham, Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, Frank Kingdon, Chester H. Rowell and Robert E. Sherwood, Vice Chairmen; Hugh Moore, Chairman, Executive Committee; Ellsworth Bunker, Chairman, Finance Committee; Frederick C. McKee, Treasurer; Roger S. Greene, Associate Director.

The End of Freedom

SENATOR BURTON K. WHEELER appeared at Buffalo for a Fourth of July speech. Competing with Communists and war-mongers — who call themselves Americans — Senator Wheeler warned a crowd of 10,000 patriots in Memorial auditorium that American entry into the war in Europe would destroy the freedom proclaimed by the founding fathers 165 years ago.

Disregarding the Bill of Rights which grants us freedom of speech, the Communists and war-mongers attempted to break up the meeting.

Handbills distributed by them read: "To win old age security defeat Hitlerism and Hitler stooges like Lindbergh and Wheeler. Such men as Wheeler and Lindbergh menace America."

A gentleman in the audience gave Senator Wheeler one of the handbills as he arose to speak in a debate on the war issue with Senator Claude Pepper, noted Florida war-hawk.

The Senator waved the yellow sheet to illustrate what form of government the American people could expect if they traveled 3,000 miles "to make the world safe for democracy."

Said he: "As for me, I hate one-man government, whether it be called Naziism, Fascism or Communism. As Americans, we hold one faith, we acknowledge one loyalty, we follow one flag. We are a nation united for peace and a nation united against war."

Referring to Secretary Knox of the Navy, the Senator termed him the "recreant and fire-eating Secretary of the Navy who represents the drift toward one-man government in Washington today."

Comment

Westbrook Pegler

PEGLER earns his daily bread by writing a syndicated article for newspapers which depend, in large part, upon Jewish controlled advertisers for their existence.

Recently, Pegler has been getting in bad with the Jews. We mean that he has been attacking the labor racketeers. He did a fairly good job on exposing some of them and had the audacity to shoot straight at certain C.I.O. bulldozers whose skins are as impregnable as superman's.

For this he was loudly cussed out on loading platforms where delivery boys concocted the old-fashioned idea of scuttling the papers which carried his blast.

On another occasion he wrote a classic about an unnamed keyhole peeper only to invite recriminations of a subversive nature which were whispered in the precincts of the Ghetto.

Peg overshot the mark, as any thoroughgoing newspaper man can attest; for one in Pegler's position can't wham the Jewish interests and be *persona grata* to the boys who control circulation.

Then it happened! Westbrook Pegler, trying to make a left-handed act of contrition for his journalistic faux pas, concocted an article entitled, "Leaders of the Reds" in which, contrary to all history and documentary evidence, he tried to show that Jews were not responsible for engendering Communism.

He had the effrontery to state that Jews as a class are not strongly predisposed to Communism when, a few months back, one would need a ten-foot diameter magnifying glass to find five Jewish national organizations not supporting Communism.

Grasping at a straw to salvage his argument, he said:

"Very strangely, some of the most evil propaganda and incitation comes from a Catholic priest, Father Coughlin, and one or two others of the same cloth, aided by intemperate publications . . ."

SOCIAL JUSTICE challenges Pegler with a $5,000 bait.

The above article speaks for itself.

Anticipating that thousands of persons will want to know the contents of the book, "An Answer to Father Coughlin's Critics," we have had printed a sufficient number of copies to satisfy the curiosity of our fellow citizens.

This week a copy of the book will be mailed to Westbrook Pegler to give him an opportunity of earning some easy money or backing down to the sidewalks where he belongs.

"Fair Enough" is a slogan coined by Pegler.

It will be fair enough for him and fair enough for us — unless his copyrighted slogan is nothing but eyewash.

All persons requesting a copy of "An Answer to Father Coughlin's Critics" are invited to write to SOCIAL JUSTICE Publishing Company at Royal Oak, Michigan, this week. The book is free for the asking.

By this time, every journalist knows that the Father Coughlin smear is no longer a smear. What the Royal Oak priest said on November 20, 1938, about the Jews still holds water. It has never been refuted — which fact Pegler should know, if he were more concerned with truth than with his job.

And to make matters worse, this dollar-a-word writer recited a litany of Irish names to prove that they were the big-shots in the Communist movement in America.

If Pegler is so fly-paperish for money, we will give him a chance to earn some.

Here is how: We will send him a copy of "An Answer to Father Coughlin's Critics," which tells the Jewish story in relation to Communism. If he can disprove one substantial statement made in that book, SOCIAL JUSTICE will pay him an honorarium of $5,000.

Come one, Peg. Shut up or put up.

Prove you are right or we are wrong.

Professor Fisher on Debt, Money, Booms, Depressions

THE AMAZING borrowing power of the Administration seems at last to have thrown a scare into such heretofore Main Line economists as Professor Irving Fisher, of Yale University.

Professor Fisher has always appeared to see the evils of our present monetary setup. However, like many other economists, he has been a bit timid in attacking the citadel of gold hoarders and international financiers. He probably has been afflicted with the knowledge that Yale University carries on its list of endowing patrons many who consider gold and private money twin Sacred Cows.

Out in Los Angeles recently Professor Fisher let down his hair. The *Los Angeles Daily News* carried a series of quotations which would indicate a renaissance of economic intelligence at Old Eli. Rapid inflation is the *bete noir* of Professor Fisher as it is to many Main Liners at present. He is quoted as saying:

"We are now emerging from the worst depression of all time. Depressions and booms are the chills and fever of business and every businessman needs to give them attention . . . to study legislation that will prevent them and to guide his personal interests.

"It is true that booms and depressions may be due to non-monetary causes, but the big ones are usually due primarily to monetary causes, even when they start otherwise.

"With the $7-billion national defense appropriation just enacted on top of our previous increases in our national debt, I have no hesitation in forecasting a boom.

"Moreover this boom is sure to turn into harmful inflation unless the proper remedy is applied."

The eminent economist further pointed out that if the $7-billion were to be raised entirely from taxation there would be no inflation, but he deprecated taxation as a source of this revenue. He favored Government financing by sale of bonds to the public. Right here he goes down the line with the new policy of the Treasury Department aimed at siphoning existing credit and currency out of the hands of the people and into the coffers of the Government. He is striking more specifically at real evils when he says:

"But it will be difficult and almost impossible to carry out such a program unless our present monetary system is altered, as it should be, for our present monetary system is tied to bank loans. This tie should be cut before we are safe from inflation and deflation.

"Let us suppose that nothing is done to reform our monetary system by which money is tied to debt, and the Government, instead of being able to float its bonds easily among savers, resorts to the usual expedient of selling the bonds to banks in return for new credits — that is deposits subject to check.

"Unless the path toward this course of action is cut off by monetary reform the Government will do as it did in the last war and create $7-billion worth of new circulating medium by selling bonds to the banks."

Professor Fisher went on to say that, under present laws, banks with existing reserves have the power to extend enormous credit and could handle the $7-billion bond issue overnight with "check book" money that never existed before. (Frequently referred to by Father Coughlin as "fountain pen money".)

This, he said, would step up the circulating medium faster than business is demanding, lead inevitably to higher prices and the ills that follow inflation.

Sketching the relationship between Government, banker and citizen under the present monetary system, Professor Fisher said:

"The bank does not lend either the citizen or the Government pre-existing money, it merely extends newly-created credit.

"This is the kind of tieup between money and banking which we have gradually fostered in this country for two generations and the chief reason for our booms and depressions.

"If we could depend upon people going into debt to the banks only exactly as fast as other people go out of debt to the banks, there would be no inflation or deflation.

"But when, as in 1928, there is a mass movement, toward speculation, some people go into debt faster than others go out, with a result that more money is created than destroyed and there is inflation and a boom.

"When there is a mass movement to get out of debt, either because the creditors demand it or the debtors become frightened, more circulating medium is destroyed than is created and there is deflation and depression.

"Between the stock market crash in 1929, and the bank holiday in 1933, this deflation occurred to the tune of $8-billion.

"Bank deposits in the country, subject to check, shrunk from $22-billion to $14-billion.

"Just as the depression was caused by destruction of check book money, so now the creation of $7-billion in check book money leads to a boom and inflation."

In conclusion Professor Fisher urged his listeners to support a proposal made to Congress by outstanding economists of the country that a monetary control, which might be the Federal Reserve Banks, be given the sole power to create or destroy the circulating medium of the country. Under this proposal, he said, the monetary board could increase or diminish the amount of circulating medium as required by business. Thus booms and depressions would be averted.

The Professor falls a little short of what is actually desired. He should go the whole distance and recommend that the constitutional power to issue and regulate money be exercised by Congress.

Comment

Time Magazine on Bishop Hurley

TO LET our friends know where *Time Magazine* stands on Bishop Hurley's speech which advocated the scuttling of our Constitution and Bill of Rights by handing over the powers to declare war to Mr. Roosevelt, we reproduce the following:

"One of the Vatican's most trusted servants in the U. S. raised the first forthright, authoritative Catholic voice last week against any idea that Hitler's war against Russia was a holy crusade. Two months ago this same bishop — the Most Rev. Joseph Patrick Hurley, who was dispatched from a Vatican post to St. Augustine, Fla., last Autumn — was the first to proclaim Naziism a worse enemy than Communism.

"In a radio address on 'Papal Pronouncements and American Foreign Policy,' Bishop Hurley cried: 'Crusade forsooth! Not God, but the enemy of God, wills it; its standard is not the Cross, but the swastika which a great Pontiff called 'this foe of the Cross of Christ'; the rape of Poland is scarcely a recommendation for Christian knights; and the recluse of Berchtesgaden is badly cast for the role of Peter the Hermit . . . America's attitude toward this new war should not be swayed by Nazi propaganda; it must be based on purely strategic considerations. The Nazi remains Enemy No. 1 of America and of the world.'

"Of a 'small but noisy group of Catholics' — the Coughlinites and Christian Fronters who currently stooge for the crusade idea — Bishop Hurley said: 'We have suffered long from their tantrums. We have blushed for shame when they acted up before company as tantrum children will do in any family. Years ago they established the crank school of economics; latterly they have founded the tirade school of journalism; they are now engaged in popularizing the ostrich school of strategy.

" 'The school may change its curriculum, but the same professors hold the chairs, for they are specialists in the universe of knowledge. Many Catholics are inclined to apologize for them; but I think that is unwise. They are embarrassing but not significant, and quite harmless as long as their tantrums do not lead them to break the furniture. They will disappear in time like those other exhibitionists — the marathon dancers and flagpole sitters — who amused America for a while and vanished.'

"More startling was Bishop Hurley's view that President Roosevelt alone should decide upon the U. S. entry into the war: 'It is up to him to safeguard the interests of the nation in times of great emergency . . . He must be ready to act fast and decisively should the need arise . . . The problem (of entering the war) should be left to the Commander in Chief who alone, in loyal communication with Congress and in consultation with his military and naval advisers, is capable of bringing us safely through . . .

" 'It is not the business of a churchman to call for war but neither may a churchman do anything other than encourage a government to protect . . . its sacred national interests . . . I believe that our Government in this awful hour may with justice say to certain churchmen: 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's!' "

* * *

Incidentally — following the first report carried in some newspapers to the effect that Bishop Hurley spoke under the auspices of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the *Detroit Free Press* carried a correction to the effect that the Bishop of St. Augustine spoke on his own authority and on his own responsibility. But the *Detroit Times* later stated that the speech nevertheless was distributed by the N. C. W. C.

Bishop Hurley as yet has made no act of contrition for his eggregious blundering in advocating the practical surrender by Congress of its right to declare war.

Nor has he recanted many other errors which appeared in his broadcast.

After the good Bishop will have spent a year or more in America, he will learn how dangerous it is to express un-American views in our midst or to stooge for any group.

As for *Time Magazine* giving such prominence to a clerical interventionist, and so little prominence to the so-called clerical isolationists, no further comment is needed.

Reds' *Daily Worker* Praises Bishop

A PROMINENT editorial in *The Daily Worker* — Communistic sheet — of July 8 gives direct but fulsome praise to Bishop Hurley and his recent abdication broadcast.

Once it was said that a man is not only known by his friends but also by his enemies.

We wonder if that old saw still holds true.

Here is what the official Communist newspaper says of Bishop Hurley:

"In a national radio address last Sunday, Bishop Joseph P. Hurley, of the Roman Catholic Diocese of St. Augustine, Fla., expressed the sentiment of a growing number of Catholics here and everywhere who realize that Hitler menaces religious freedom as well as democratic liberties and peace.

"Bishop Hurley attacked the 'small but noisy Catholic publicists who have been giving expression to views which are comforting to the Axis powers.' It is clear therefore that those who profess to speak in the name of the Catholic Church — such demagogs as Coughlin and other friends of Hitler — do not speak in the name of the Church or the democratic Catholic masses. Coughlin is to be sharply differentiated from the Catholic people whom he is doing great harm by his fascist attempts to arouse religious antagonisms between Protestants, Catholics, Jewish people and other religious denominations.

"Millions of Catholics and other Americans will second Bishop Hurley who pierced the 'anti-Communist' veil which Hitler has raised to screen every one of his attacks against the independence and freedom of nations.

"Just as Bishop Hurley, as the whole world knows, disagrees with the principles of Communism, so do the Communists have many disagreements with Bishop Hurley. But it is beyond disagreement among democratic people, regardless of religious or other affiliation, that the main danger to the national and social security of the American people is Hitler and Hitlerism. Thus regardless of disagreement on other matters, the issue around which all people must and can unite today is the destruction of Hitlerism."

Again we remind our readers what Pope Pius XI said: "See to it, Venerable Brethren, that the faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived! Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any manner whatsoever."

A Catholic Dissents

IT WILL be impossible to reproduce the many letters arriving at our office related to the most unfortunate statement made by Bishop Hurley.

We are satisfied to produce the following sample:

Detroit, Mich.
July 10, 1941

His Excellency,

Most Reverend Joseph P. Hurley, D.D.,
Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese,
St. Augustine, Florida.

Dear Reverend Sir:

By way of introduction — I am just an ordinary layman of the faith that your Excellency by the grace of God administers in his high office.

I am astonished at the article that appeared in the local newspapers of Detroit with a Washington date of July 6 and 7 — "Let President Decide on War" — "People lack the facts and experience," Prelate says — Leave Decision on War to F.D.R., Prelate says — with this remarkable statement — "We must not lose sight of the fact that declaration of war, the constitutional prerogative of the Congress is no longer in style; the Nazis have seen to that." The whole article has the earmarks of having been prepared by some clever politician close to the powers in Washington and then handed to you to pull his chestnuts out of the fire and drag the church into this unholy controversy. That has been their weak link — you have come to their rescue!

As a result of the last war, may I be permitted to quote the following letter:

Camp De Meucon, France,
December 31, 1918

To William J. Nagel,
Post Office, Detroit, Mich.

Dear Sir:

I regret to inform you that your brother, Harry Nagel, a private in this organization, died Dec. 6 at the base hospital here as a result of lobar pneumonia. The delay in notifying you is due to the fact that we have been unable up to the present to get the emergency address from his service record, which had been sent to another office.

Private Nagel was a good soldier, Mr. Nagel — always well behaved and obedient to orders — and while he did not fall on the field of active battle, he served his country to the best of his ability — you and his other relatives can be proud of his record, I assure you, and the officers and men of his battery join in extending to you the deepest sympathy for his loss.

Very sincerely yours,
Claude F. Porter,
Capt. 8 F. A.,
Commanding Battery E.

(Continued on Page 7)

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Economic Parity With Canada

MONTHS ago SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine expressed its opinion that economic parity would be established between Canada and the United States.

In plainer language, this means pegging the Canadian dollar at the face value of the United States dollar.

All this would be brought about, so we indicated, as a likely result of England's defeat at the hands of Hitler.

Recently, the United States Government, co-operating with the Canadian government, struck off a commission to explore the feasibility of economic ties between Canada and the United States.

The United States' committee includes, among others, Harry D. White, director of monetary research for the Treasury Department, and Prof. Alvin H. Hansen of Harvard University, who is connected with the Federal Reserve System.

These two names indicate the trend which the economic conference will take.

Noisy Minority—The War-Mongers

UNDER the above caption the *Ave Maria* Magazine (July 5) printed the following editorial:

"When we remarked to a New Yorker the other day that the Gothamites were overwhelmingly for war, he told us of a boy in the Eastern lake region who telegraphed to a Chicago firm: 'Can ship you a thousand frog skins. Can you use them?' The firm replied that they could use all the skins he could send them, and a few days later they received a small package containing one skin, accompanied by the following note: 'This is all there was. He fooled me by his hollering!'

* * *

"Our friend assured us that the interventionists in New York do a lot of 'hollering,' but that they do not constitute a great portion of the population. A few weeks ago, he said, a rally was advertised. It was to be held in the Academy of Music and featured such celebrities as Senator Pepper; the baseball magnate Larry McPhail, the president of the Brooklyn Dodgers, and others. Twenty-five-cent tickets were given away free in the hope of drawing a crowd, and sound trucks advertised the meeting throughout the city.

"Despite all the ballyhoo only eight hundred persons could be corralled for the meeting.

"The America First meeting a few weeks before filled the academy and the overflow hall, yet could not accommodate all the crowd. The same thing has happened at every meeting of the non-interventionists. People had to be turned away.

"The war-mongers have louder voices and are much bolder than the peace loving citizens, but they are not numerous if one may judge from results."

A Jesuit Editorial

OUR CONTEMPORARY, the Jesuit magazine *America*, definitely has hewed to the line of solid reason and plain sense in dealing with the Axis-British-Russo war.

And this, despite political pronouncements made by Bishop Hurley and lesser lights — including Monsignor Ryan — who are endeavoring to persuade us that Naziism is enemy No. 1 of Christianity; and that America's duty is to get into a shooting war.

In the July 5th issue, *America* said:

"Before the first echoes died down announcing war between Germany and Russia, immediately diplomats were busy with proposals of United States aid to the Soviets. Russia's ambassador, Mr. Oumansky, did not know, nobody knows, what Russia needs; but aid would be sent even if we have to invent something to aid with. Overnight the *Daily Worker* performed another of its accustomed flipflops, slipped delightedly into the old harness of anti-Fascism, though not anti-war. Democracy, 'the World of Tomorrow' and its freedoms are forgotten; alliance is proposed with Russia and China along with Britain. These are mere antepasto for a groaning feast of pro-Soviet propaganda to come. Drums will be beat to persuade workers to contribute to Soviet-and-Liberty funds. Familiar shrieks, smears, intimidations of pro-Loyalist hate campaigns will be resurrected. Labor will learn it must sign up for the *profsoyuz*, if it is to escape Dr. Ley and his slave battalions. The Soviet past will be happy bygones. Biographies of noble Soviet leaders will be plentiful; fine freedom-loving lads who escaped the purge because they saw the bright future glittering over Stalin's brow. We can prepare, in short, for a spate of Communist and Soviet indoctrination such as we have not endured since the palmiest days of Walter Duranty and Harry F. Ward.

"Harm of such pro-Soviet propaganda, however, is immeasurably increased if we permit it to jockey us into the false position of enthusiasm for Hitler in our disgust at the machinations of Stalin. Such a consummation will have the singular effect of delighting both opposing dictators at once; Hitler will see us brought in line with his new-found and specious type of anti-Communism; Stalin as another confirmation of the staple Communist thesis that if you are not one-hundred-per-cent for Red revolution you are a Fascist. As Catholics and as patriotic Americans our position remains unaltered by this latest development in the European scene. The Church stands upon its steadfast and consistent opposition to every form of totalitarianism and tyranny, whether it be under the hooked cross or the hammer and sickle. It is significant that regardless of Italy's entrance into the war against Russia, no indication has so far been received from the Holy See that the Holy Father is endorsing it as any crusade or holy war. We shudder at the threat to the whole world implied in a Soviet triumph; but we also shudder at the menace of a Hitler victory that would place not only Russia's wheat, coal and oil at Hitler's mercy against the world, but would place Communism itself and its cohorts at his disposal. There is but one clear conclusion to be derived from the Russian-German war: by all that is sane, just and holy, let America keep out of this war."

The smear brigade, most likely, will affirm that the Jesuit editorials are pro-Nazi and un-American — and in a direct manner. In an indirect manner the Agars — superintending the elite, silver spoon school in News Jersey — together with the Ryans, will attempt to accomplish the same smear as they permit themselves to be quoted as outstanding Catholics.

Time is on the side of the Jesuits and all others who oppose our entrance into war. Following the war — as has always happened — the suffering citizenry of this country will turn on the war-mongers and their abettors. This time extremities may be anticipated.

Then, Bishop Hurley and Monsignor John Ryan and Mr. Agar will run to seek sanctuary in some Jesuit institution.

Of course, when just reprisals will be meted out to them, the war-mongering clerics' friends will raise the hue and cry of "persecution."

Comment

(Continued from Page 5)

P. S. The designation of his grave is Section A, No. 79, Post Cemetery No. 20, Camp De Meucon, France. Effects are being forwarded.

I learned later that he died from exposure in the water and mud of the trenches. His remains were left in France as lasting evidence of the colossal blunder that was made by our Country's entry into that war, and from which we have had nothing but turmoil and trouble ever since — and for what purpose may I respectfully ask you? Surely the world was not made safe for democracy. Now the authorities are about to draft my son for the present "emergency," and I wonder often, and distressingly, if I am to receive another letter, similar to the foregoing one in the near future, as is indicated by your attitude in this very grave situation.

As you well know — every Catholic who attends the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass during these turbulant days most devoutly repeats with the priest the following appropriate prayer:

Oh, God, from whom are all holy desires and just works, give to thy servants that peace which the world cannot give. Grant that we may be devoted to the keeping of Thy commandments, our country spared the horrors of war and our brothers in other lands blessed with the gifts of Thy peace. Through Christ Our Lord. Amen. Queen of Peace, pray for us!

In view of this wholesome and devout prayer to Almighty God, that "our country be spared the horrors of War," may I most reverently ask you how it is possible for you to reconcile your position and attitude as it is disclosed by these newspaper articles, with the spirit of this gracious prayer deeply resounding in the heart of every earnest believer?

Most respectfully and sincerely yours,

William J. Nagel.

* * *

Mr. Nagel has expressed the point of view common to most of our correspondents — and common to every good Catholic lady and gentleman and child whose knees long since have grown calloused in praying for peace while certain of their clerical leaders have been busy arranging for war.

In the long run the poor people will have their way.

The Holy Ghost — the Father of the Poor — is still with them.

Our Communist Allies

WHILE President Roosevelt speaks majestically of carrying the "four freedoms" to the ends of the earth, freedom in America is being sabotaged in the name of freedom.

Congressman Joe Starnes of Alabama, vice chairman of the Dies Committee on un-American activities, currently investigating subversive elements in national defense work, has announced that Communist election petitions in Philadelphia have been signed by 83 employes of the navy yard in that city and by 40 employes in the Government-owned Frankford arsenal.

Of the other signers of the Red election petition 157 worked "in other Government positions"; 425 were miscellaneous workers; 114 were transportation workers in the city; 510 were employes of the W.P.A.; five were connected with a Philadelphia electric company; and 12 were school teachers.

Communism aims at the complete destruction of the American form of government, American institutions and American traditions. Yet these Communist plotters work unmolested in American navy yards, arsenals, schools, transportation systems, the W.P.A. and, according to other disclosures by the Dies Committee, in the Government itself.

* * *

Such infiltration is part and parcel of the Moscow-directed conspiracy in progress for 24 years. Still our Government remains apathetic.

Only the other day the House of Representatives grudgingly voted — and the Senate Appropriations Committee vetoed — an appropriation of $100,000 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation ". . . to investigate the employes of every department, agency and independent establishment of the Federal Government."

Significantly, the appropriation, proposed in the interest of protecting billions of dollars in defense orders, was opposed by every radical and subversive organization in the nation.

Furthermore, Attorney-General Robert Jackson — now Supreme Court Justice — was reported to have informed the Senate Committee that the appropriation was unnecessary.

For eight years America has been squandering billions of dollars on "social experiments"; but when it is proposed to give the F.B.I. funds to investigate a prolonged attack on the very fundamentals of the American way of life, the money is withheld.

When Reds in navy yards can sign Communist election petitions with impunity it ought to be evident to every American that this nation will share the fate of France if it becomes involved in war. Making democracy safe in Pago-Pago and Ding-Dong sounds sublime and idealistic when propounded by a mellifluous radio voice. However, it would seem more practical to make democracy safe in our navy yards and arsenals first and to safeguard the workers, soldiers, sailors and airplane pilots whose lives are endangered by Red sabotage.

* * *

The Government should institute a thorough purge of all Federal services, especially those connected with national defense. Otherwise this Administration will be held responsible by a bereaved people for the criminal murder of America's soldiers, sailors and airmen. Enough young pilots and experienced airmen already have lost their lives in sabotaged planes to indicate that the Government must take some steps to prevent further planned fatalities.

We have an unlimited national emergency. Let us have some unlimited and immediate emergency action to destroy the fifth columnists who are undermining national defense and our social structure.

We have all-out aid to the democracies — including the "greatest democracy," Soviet Russia. It is high time we also have all-out aid to the defenders of America and all-out annihilation of the America's internal enemies.

The concept of democracy and democratic liberties is grossly distorted when the enemies of democracy and Christianity are permitted to carry on their subversive work unhampered.

The New France

THE Associated Press (July 8) cables from Vichy the following information relative to the New France which Marshal Petain is endeavoring to create:

> France, July 8 — The new France will weigh the value as well as the number of ballots that are cast, Chief of State Marshal Petain declared today in an address of guidance to the committee which he has named to write a new constitution.
>
> He thus indicated his desire to do away with universal male suffrage in the state he envisages, one which he said must be "authoritarian and hierarchic."
>
> The main problem, he said, is to "replace a 'sovereign people' exercising absolute rights in total irresponsibility, with a people whose rights derive from their duties."
>
> He defined the people he wants as a hierarchy of families, professions and communities which must in turn produce a "hierarchy of men who are selected by service rendered to the community, of whom a small number will advise, a few command and, at the top, the chiefs who will govern."
>
> In the past, he said, authority came from sheer numbers; in the future, it must come from the "natural groups without which there is neither people, state nor nation."
>
> Specifically, he went on, authority must come from the family — "a commune which is a federation of families and organized professions and trades."

* * *

France was known as the eldest daughter of the Church. One of the first nations to accept Christianity, she saw her kings nurture it until it spread to every city, hamlet and rural community throughout the empire.

Unfortunately, her kings and nobles became preoccupied with the materialities of life to the detriment of the spiritualities.

Unfortunately, too many of her upper clergymen followed suit.

As a result, the peasant class starved; injustice was protected; vice was rewarded and virtue condemned. At length the weeds of Bourbonism all but choked the flower of Christianity.

Napoleon's revolution was quickly followed by other revolutions. It was only yesterday that the third French Republic folded its flag — a flag that had been launched in the name of democracy over a people held in bondage by subversive minorities.

And now, France is about to be reborn. International democracy and international capitalism — almost twins — are driven from France.

A suffering people, having paid for their deception, are hopeful that their Christian leader will establish a polity which will merit once more for their country the glorious name of eldest daughter of the Church.

Behind the War

England, U. S. May Try Invasion of Nazi Europe

WHEN juxtaposed, several recent incidents and statements at home and abroad, though apparently unrelated, seem to lend credence to current reports that Great Britain's military and naval leaders are contemplating a joint British-American invasion of continental Europe.

The ranking British generals, Wavell and Auchinleck, have been quoted as saying that American troops will be necessary to defeat Hitler.

American army chiefs advocate retention of draftees for the duration of the war emergency, and authorization to send troops anywhere in the world.

Soviet Russia has urged Great Britain to undertake an attack on Germany while the Nazis are preoccupied with their struggle against the Soviet.

And finally, the United States, by occupying Iceland, has actually entered the war zone, bolstered the line of supply between this country and England and established a base for possible operations in Europe.

* * *

Some observers explain that British leaders believe the war would drag on interminably unless Great Britain and her allies, including the United States, launch an invasion of the German-controlled continent.

While the success of such an undertaking might be extremely dubious in view of the disastrous British campaigns in Norway, France, Greece and Crete, nevertheless the Russo-German war has brightened prospects considerably. Fighting simultaneously on two fronts Nazi strength might be divided sufficiently to permit an Allied force to gain a solid foothold either in one of the German-conquered nations or in northern Germany itself.

The invasion may be launched within 90 days, providing Soviet Russia continues resisting the Nazi blitzkrieg in the East. It is reported in some quarters that American diplomats and militarists already have been informed of the possible invasion attempt, and that the United States is preparing to contribute an expeditionary force of men, ships and planes for the venture. This rumor seems to tie in with the Administration's and the Army's efforts to retain draftees and to secure authority to dispatch them anywhere in the world.

* * *

British reconnaisance fliers have told their leaders that the Nazis have drastically reduced the number of troops holding the coasts of France, Belgium and Holland. British bomber and fighter pilots, however, report that German gun emplacements are still in operation and that the coast is fairly well protected by shore batteries. But Britain has been sending miniature invasion forces — raiding parties — in fast torpedo boats to the French coast, and these raiders have returned to England after wreaking considerable damage on Nazi-held air fields, power plants, truck encampments, etc.

Hitler appears to be aware of the possibility of a British invasion attempt, for Nazi forces in the North recently have been augmented.

Sweden plays an important role in Britain's invasion plans, and consequently efforts are being made to win her support. English diplomats are relying upon Madame Kollontai, Soviet Ambassadress to Sweden, to swing Sweden into line.

This lady in Red enjoys considerable influence among Swedish leaders. It was she who persuaded Sweden not to permit the landing of British troops and supplies for the beleaguered Finns in the latters' war with Russia in 1939-40. While the Soviet was still allied with Germany she also promised Sweden that Russia would defend the Swedes in the event of attack by Germany.

* * *

Now that the Reds and Nazis are locked in combat, the British expect Madame Kollontai to convince the Swedes that they should permit Britain to use Swedish ports and other facilities for shipping supplies to Russia and men and materials necessary for an attack on northern Germany.

That portion of the Reich is not as well fortified as her other borders. Hence the strategists entertain hopes of success, providing Madame Kollontai paves the way.

Judging by some accounts, however, she may encounter difficulty, for it is reported that Sweden has granted permission to Germany to transport one division of Nazi troops across Sweden for action against Russia. Furthermore, it is well known that Germany, as well as Russia, is dickering for access to Sweden's valuable iron ore.

It appears, therefore, that the reported plans of an Allied invasion of Germany, though well founded, may not be executed until the Soviet first wins the diplomatic battle against Germany for the friendship and co-operation of Sweden.

Radical Refugees Entering America

THE United States Government is encouraging the immigration to this country of "revolutionaries" and radical labor leaders whose applications for visas are sponsored by private organizations in New York City.

That is the import of a cablegram sent last Fall by the United States Ambassador to Soviet Russia, John Steinhardt, to the State Department in Washington. It was recently inserted in the *Congressional Record* by Senator Robert R. Reynolds of North Carolina.

Mr. Steinhardt's message, dated October 5, 1940, disclosed that the State Department on August 22, 1940, had ordered American consular officials in foreign nations "not to issue visas to refugees unless satisfied that the applicants were 'well-informed intellectuals or labor leaders."

The Ambassador charged that a majority of aliens seeking visitors' permits to enter the United States have not "the slightest intention of leaving the United States."

He said further that a State Department regulation of September 26, 1940, in effect waived "the examination, which it is my understanding the statute requires be conducted in the field."

"It thus becomes clear," he observed, "that the (State) Department is now relying on the sponsoring organizations in the United States . . .

"I am unable to comprehend such reliance on alleged information said to be available in the United States with regard to large numbers of individuals residing thousands of miles away, virtually none of whom are personally known to their sponsors as appears from their examination."

* * *

Steinhardt charged that the sponsoring organizations have "grossly misrepresented to the Department the intellectual or labor status as well as the future intentions of virtually all of these aliens thus far examined."

Formerly, Steinhardt continued, the burden of proof was on the alien to show that he was eligible for admission; but now the burden of proof has been shifted to the consular officer.

"Obviously," he remarked, "it will be virtually impossible for the examining officer to obtain specific information regarding the possible future activities of these individuals in the United States and in order to be able to assume that there is reason to believe that they will engage in activities inimical to the United States.

"I find that in many cases," the Ambassador added, "the applicants whose names were transmitted by the Department were politically active in Poland and elsewhere.

"Some were office holders and members of the Zionist Labor Party and of the Bund; others are employes of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in Warsaw and subsequently in Vilna. Some of the alleged rabbis have never had congregations outside of their own families. Several of the applicants appear to have been professional political agitators. Thus far, not a single well-known intellectual or labor leader has made an appearance at the Embassy unless a teacher of geography in a Kovno high school is to be regarded as a well-known intellectual, and anyone performing manual labor is to be regarded as a labor leader.

"I am persuaded that the best interests of the United States at this time will not be served by admitting individuals of this type in large groups, especially individuals who have co-operated with one another over a period of years and who might well transplant their entire political organization to the United States, particularly as I am not convinced that many of them intend to depart from the United States at the expiration of these so-called visits.

"Furthermore, I believe it to be dangerous to allow groups to enter the United States indiscriminately merely because the members of these groups have been sponsored by organizations in the United States which have not hesitated to misrepresent to the Department and who are obviously more interested in finding a haven for these unfortunates than they are in safeguarding the welfare of the United States at the most critical period of its history. I still regard admission to the United States as a privilege, not a right."

War for 'Democracy' Brings—

The Return of Litvinov, Godless Revolutionary

THE REAPPEARANCE of Maxim Litvinov on the international scene after an absence of two years warrants a brief review of his gangster career.

Deposed of his post as Soviet foreign commissar in May, 1939, Litvinov was in total eclipse until his radio address last week from Moscow, urging Great Britain to attack Hitler from the West while Russia was engaging him in the East.

Denouncing "Fascist barbarity" and speaking glowingly of emancipating enslaved peoples, Litvinov may have reached the hearts of some Americans ignorant of his own record of lawlessness.

* * *

As a starter for his life of national and international crime Litvinov stole his name. He was born "Meyer Moiseyevitch Vallakh" in Bialystok, Russia, in 1879, the son of a Jewish merchant. At the age of 17 he was dishonorably discharged from the Russian Imperial Army because he was deemed a detrimental influence to his regiment.

At 18 he joined the radical Social Democratic Party, worked in a twine factory and became friendly with two other radical Jews named Rosenfeld and Apfelbaum. Rosenfeld, under the name of Kamenev, later rose to prominence in the Soviet government and Apfelbaum, under the name Zinoviev, also became a high Soviet official. In the early days of their association all three were jailed for revolutionary activities, but escaped during a prison revolt.

In the May 15, 1939, issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE, Litvinov's career thereafter is recorded as follows:

At the age of 21, Litvinov, working in a Jewish-owned sugar factory, was found stealing money to finance his revolutionary friends, and served a year's prison sentence.

During 1902-03 he belonged to a group of revolutionaries in Berlin, transfering his residence to Switzerland, where he met Lenin and Trotzky, and planned the infamous St. Petersburg massacre which came off in 1905. Here he attained his genius for forging passports, passing under the name of "Nitz."

In 1906-07 he was instrumental in sending shipments of dynamite to Russia for revolutionary purposes.

* * *

On June 13, 1906, Litvinov and Stalin bombed an Imperial Russian bank truck at Tiflis, in Caucasus, killing 30 persons. He escaped with 250,000 rubles, and was arrested in Paris in 1908 with his mistress with some of the stolen money still on him. Again sent to jail, he turned up in England at the outbreak of the World War.

In 1914-15 he acted as a spy for high Jews operating from Berlin in England, and distributed seditious literature. In 1915 he married the wealthy Ivy Low, a niece of Sir Sydney Low, originally Loewe, a Polish Jew. He engineered the notorious Leeds Conference to bring "new freedom to British workmen" in conjunction with Ramsay McDonald. He traveled extensively for the revolution in Russia.

In 1917 he was practically ordered out of England at the instigation of the then Prince of Wales, later Edward VIII, and returned to help Lenin and Trotzky set up the new regime in Russia.

In 1918 he was returned as Russian Ambassador to England but the British government — which was then truly British — refused to accept his credentials. Returning to Russia in 1919, he was refused entrance to Copenhagen by the Denmark government.

In 1920 England opened trade relations with Russia and again Litvinov was sent and again refused. Krassin was sent as a dummy while Litvinov ran the negotiations from various parts of the Scandinavian countries. Also the British secret service had conclusive data that Litvinov gained financial control of the *Daily Herald* as a means of propaganda.

* * *

In 1922 Litvinov represented Russia at the Genoa Economic Conference, and in the years, 1925, 1927 and 1932 he represented the Soviets at the disarmament conferences throughout Europe.

On May 12, 1927, the British government, through its secret service, raided the notorious Arcos House in England and found it was a powerhouse of Communist propaganda. The evidence gathered there definitely incriminated Litvinov as the brains of the ring.

In 1932 and previously, he represented the Communist cause of destructionism with various international financiers, some of whom were the Rothschilds, the Sassoons, David Weil of Lazards, Schlesinger, Robert Waley Cohen, Lord Alfred Mond and others.

The crowning achievement of Litvinov's career came on November 18, 1933, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt, without notice to his own country, officially "recognized" Russia. Litvinov was reported to have said afterwards: "As long as there are idiots to take our signature seriously and to put their trust in it, we will promise everything that is asked and as much as we like, if only we get something tangible in return."

In 1934 Litvinov was made honorary president of the Russian Godless Movement.

From 1935 Litvinov practically ran the defunct League of Nations and his usual harangue was against Germany, Italy and Japan, and those countries in South America which have banished Communism. He was the world-famous apostle of deceptive "collective security."

In 1936 Litvinov received the decoration which is the highest attainable in the blood-drenched government of Moscow, namely, The Order of Lenin, with a personal message from Stalin.

* * *

So much for Litvinov's bolshevist career, during which he has used the following aliases: Finkelstein, Meer, Hinoch, Dehtiarick, Borrissonk, Buchamann, Harrison, Papasha, Nitz, Maxitrovitch — and Litvinov.

For his future activities consult the *Jewish Criterion*. That periodical, in its July 4, 1941 issue — before Litvinov's radio address — predicted Litvinov's emergence from the background in the following observation:

"One result of the Russo-German war is expected to be the return of Maxim Litvinov to political prominence in the Soviet Union . . . In fact, those who remember Litvinov's important part in obtaining recognition for the Soviet Government from Uncle Sam believe that he may be sent over here to co-ordinate American aid to Russia."

Quick Change Artist

"WHAT A whale of a difference just a few cents make," used to be a well-known advertising slogan.

"What a whale of a difference just a *couple of months* make," could be utilized by the war-mongers in selling Soviet Russia to the American people.

For this idea we are indebted to a press association dispatch from London, July 8, describing the Soviet's Maxim Litvinov as a "long-time foe of the dictators."

Until replaced by Viacheslav Molotov, Litvinov was Dictator Stalin's right-hand man. Nevertheless, he is identified in the newspapers as a "long-time foe of the dictators."

We *do* hope some one can explain.

Hitler Heat Wave

A STOP HITLER FIRST RALLY, sponsored by the Union for Democratic Action, was held recently at Manhattan Center in New York City.

One of the speakers, Herbert Agar, called for the immediate blood sacrifice of American boys to defeat Hitler.

The lack of enthusiasm of Americans to help God save the King was demonstrated by the attendance figure — less than 1,000.

Last April over 25,000 massed outside Manhattan Center in the rain to hear Charles Lindbergh urge American neutrality — leaving the Hitler First boys at the wrong end of a 25-1 ratio.

But the *New York Times* refuses to be convinced.

Next day it blamed the Stop Hitler low attendance on the "weather."

Indeed it was a hot night.

But as advertised in the *Times* by the rally promoters, Manhattan Center is air conditioned!

Perhaps, the *New York Times* does not consider advertisement *facts* "fit to print."

TIME IS PASSING — $2,500.00 IS WAITING!

YOU STILL HAVE TIME TO COME ON IN AND CLEAN UP

GOING! GOING! GONE!

That is what is happening to your opportunity to enter and win $2,500.00 in our great "JUBILEE" Contest, now sweeping on towards its close.

There is still time for you to enter and harvest the Grand Prize of $2,500.00; the Second Prize of $1,500.00; the Third Prize of $1,000.00, or any of the remaining 108 grand prizes.

AND REMEMBER — A CONTESTANT WHO FAILS TO LAND AMONG THE 108 WINNERS OF GRAND PRIZES WILL BE REWARDED FOR HIS OR HER EFFORTS BY A COMMISSION OF TEN PER CENT OF ALL BUSINESS TURNED IN. COMMISSIONS WILL BE PAID AT THE END OF THIS SECOND PERIOD, NOW RUNNING FROM JULY 1 TO JULY 28, AND AT THE END OF THE CONTEST.

It's a great race, no question about that. There is yet no way of telling who will come out on top or in the big money. It will be a see-saw right to the very tape.

But, it is altogether possible that some "dark horse" will enter the contest this week and wind up on top of the heap when the whistle blows. Those things have happened before — and such a person could be yourself.

So, enter NOW while you have time. Keep in mind that the "GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY" or second contest period closes on July 28. Between now and then you will earn 30,000 Extra Bonus Votes on all new subscriptions of one or two years you send in.

Get into the contest while you are able to pile up a big Bonus Vote. For, that's what counts when the votes are all in and the counting for the prizes starts.

Use the entering coupons TODAY.

KEEP THESE IN MIND

FIRST GRAND PRIZE	$2,500
Second Grand Prize	1,500
Third Grand Prize	1,250
Fourth Grand Prize	750
Fifth Grand Prize	650
Sixth Grand Prize	550
Seventh Grand Prize	400
Eighth Grand Prize	300
100 Additional Grand Prizes	1,000
27 Special Cash Prizes	1,100
TOTAL CASH PRIZES	$10,000

Address All Contest Mail to:

"CONTEST EDITOR"

SOCIAL JUSTICE

Royal Oak, Mich.

SPECIAL PRIZES TO BE WON RIGHT NOW!

The Special Prizes offered for this "GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY" Period of the great "JUBILEE" Contest afford you a wondrous chance to strike for some quick money.

Whether or not you are entered — YOU CAN WIN THEM — if you do a bit of scampering about. If you are already entered — go out and close some "deals" you have had "on the fire" for new subs.

If you are not yet entered, you can enter right TODAY, and win one of these Specials. Remember there are five of them:

First Special Prize	$150.00
Second Special Prize	80.00
Third Special Prize	70.00
Fourth Special Prize	60.00
Fifth Special Prize	40.00

ALL OF THESE AWARDS ARE TO BE GIVEN ON A BASIS OF NEW SUBSCRIPTION MONEY TURNED IN DURING THIS SECOND CONTEST PERIOD — FROM JULY 1 TO JULY 28.

And also please remember —

Every Contestant will receive a commission of TEN PER CENT on all business turned in during the entire contest — but, winners of grand prizes do NOT receive commission and prizes too.

Schedule of Regular Votes

ON PREPAID SUBSCRIPTIONS TO

Social Justice Magazine

Subscriptions	Votes
6 months ($1.50) . . .	4,000
1 year ($3.00)	10,000
2 years ($6.00)	30,000

The above are Regular Votes and will maintain the same values on both new and renewed subscriptions throughout the Contest.

BONUS VOTES

On each NEW subscription (2 years or 1 year), the following bonuses will be allowed:

30,000 EXTRA Votes from July 1 to July 28.

25,000 EXTRA Votes from July 29 to August 11.

20,000 EXTRA Votes from August 12 to August 26.

Extra or Bonus Votes are issued and credited only after conclusion of the Contest.

NEW CONTESTANTS IN THE RACE

CONNECTICUT

W. C. Perry, New Haven — 35,000

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Michael Gallagher, Washington — 35,000

ILLINOIS

Wm. Grein, Chicago — 35,000
E. Mendins, Chicago — 35,000
George L. Schwarz, Chicago — 35,000
Eva Streit, Chicago — 35,000

KENTUCKY

Mary Smith, Bellevue — 35,000

MASSACHUSETTS

Lena Beauregard, New Bedford — 35,000
Mrs. Agnes B. Corrigan, Cambridge — 35,000
M. J. Donovan, Cambridge — 35,000
Mr. and Mrs. M. Gilligan, Boston — 35,000
Marguerite E. Hendrick, Belmont — 35,000
Mrs. Catherine McEvoy, So. Boston — 35,000
Mrs. Ann McNally, Milton — 35,000
Lillian M. Nickerson, Quincy — 35,000
Delia O'Connor, Medford — 5,000
Matthew O'Connor, Medford — 5,000
Mrs. Max Reinhard, Jamaica Plain — 35,000
Mary Riley, Fall River — 9,000

MICHIGAN

Dominck Nichols, Dearborn — 35,000
Mrs. Anna Peters, Royal Oak — 35,000
C. E. Swaney, Detroit — 35,000

MISSOURI

August Frant, St. Louis — 35,000

NEW JERSEY

Edward F. Collins, Union City — 35,000

NEW YORK

C. Beiring, Buffalo — 35,000
O. Bestehorn, Buffalo — 35,000
Milton Campione, St. Albans — 35,000
Daniel J. Deitz, Bronx — 35,000
James J. Duffy, Brooklyn — 35,000
Charles Freel, Brooklyn — 35,000
Mrs. J. Haney, New York City — 35,000
Miss Theresa Hartmann, Tuckahoe — 35,000
Myron J. Jackson, Northside, Cohoes — 35,000
Miss Mabell, New Rochelle — 35,000
Frank McDonnell, Geneva — 35,000
Geo. Ollen, Jamaica, L. I. — 35,000
Margaret Pearson, New York City — 35,000
Geo. C. Wall, Rochester — 35,000

NORTH CAROLINA

Mrs. Louise Gassinger, Durham — 35,000

OHIO

Mrs. Wm. Boerger, Toledo — 35,000
Mrs. Mary Carney, Youngstown — 35,000
Mrs. Carroll, Cincinnati — 35,000
Louis J. Komora, E. Cleveland — 35,000
Mary T. Lavan, Cleveland — 35,000
Herve Lonsway, Berwick — 35,000
Frank Notheis, Cleveland — 35,000
Albert Van Dam, Dayton — 35,000
Mrs. Frank Weis, Xenia — 35,000

PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. Joseph Engelhart, Philadelphia — 35,000

RHODE ISLAND

Esther M. Conlin, Johnston — 35,000
James Mullan, Providence — 35,000

WISCONSIN

Mrs. Chas. Geiss, Green Bay — 35,000
Mrs. Ida Hobelsberger, La Crosse — 35,000
Marie Schappek, Milwaukee — 35,000

THESE CAN STILL LEAD YOU TO FORTUNE

"START OFF" Subscription Coupon

(Good for 20,000 Votes))

Return this Coupon to the Contest Manager with your first yearly subscription payment ($3.00), either old or new, and you will receive 20,000 Votes, in addition to the Votes allowed on Regular Vote Schedule.

Name of subscriber _____

Address _____

City or Town _____

State _____

(Your own subscription or renewal will count.)

This Coupon accompanied by the Entry Blank and your first yearly subscription (your own or somebody else's) will start you in the great Contest with 25,000 Votes, plus the Regular Votes on the subscription as shown in the Regular Vote Schedule. Only one of these Coupons will be credited to a contestant.

ENTRY BLANK

(Good for 5,000 Votes)

_____, 1941

Contest Manager,
SOCIAL JUSTICE,
Royal Oak, Michigan.

Please enter my name as a Contestant in your "JUBILEE" Contest. I understand this Blank filled out and sent in will entitle me to 5,000 Votes and that my first yearly subscription, old or new, will entitle me to 20,000 Votes.

My Name Is _____

My Address Is _____

City or Town _____ *State* _____

ONLY ONE OF THESE COUPONS WILL BE CREDITED TO A CONTESTANT.

Comment

Biography of New Red Propagandist

THE *Sentinel*, the American Jewish Weekly of Chicago, in its issue of July 3rd, 1941, on page 3, says:

"London, JPS. (Jewish Press Service) — Dr. Solomon Lazovsky, a Jew, is the new chief of the Soviet Bureau of Information for the Foreign Press. Lazovsky also occupies the post of Assistant Foreign Minister."

On August 7, 1939, SOCIAL JUSTICE printed the following biographical sketch on Dr. Lazovsky:

"After appointing Molotov (who had never been outside of Russia) to succeed Litvinov, Stalin gave him as assistant, Lazovsky, former secretary-general of the Profintern (the International of Red Syndicates) and member of the Executive Committee of the Komintern or Third International . . .

"The *Weekly Review* says:

"Comrade Lazovsky (Salomon Abramovitch Dridzo) was one of the principal parties in the communization of the C.G.T. in France (The French C.I.O.), where he operated with false identity papers. He intervened in England in the General Strike of 1926, openly facilitating considerable funds from the Profintern. He helped to organize the textile strike in Lodz, Poland, and his instructions on the technique of the stay-in-strike are codified in the handbook 'La greve est un combat.'

"Last year, Lazovsky wrote regularly for La Vie Cuvriere, advocating the dictatorship of the proletariat. His immediate chief in the Komintern is Manouilsky, Russian Assistant Secretary of the Third International. He declared in the Communist International (April 24, 1939, pages 455-460) that 'The Communists must support any war which would hasten the victory of the world proletariat . . . this war would be the most just, the most holy in the history of humanity — a war which would necessarily kindle a whole series of revolutionary fires in the enemy's rear.'

"There are many phenomena, apparently contradictory, which are readily explained if one considers that the Communist policy and method must have two distinct phases — *the ultimate one when the proletarian world revolution is an accomplished fact;* and the preliminary period of opportunist measures, pacts and arrangements used to achieve it.

"The curious alliance, temporary though it may be, between the Communists and international finance, exists *to destroy national forms of government.* Both groups have it in common that they are international; a national patriotic government would reject Communist leaders and methods, whilst the finance group is equally anxious to prevent barter trade, self-sufficiency in home production and freedom from international financing.

"The finance group may well be prepared to take the risks involved in such a perilous combination because they know the Communist form of government (of Russia) has inherent weaknesses which sooner or later mean its downfall. The Russian Communist government's position at home is said, apparently with good reason, to be extremely precarious; but it may yet do one last service to international finance if it assists in the destruction of nationalistic doctrines which deprive the money power of its means of living."

Comment on the above article is unnecessary. We will be satisfied if Bishop Hurley, Monsignor Ryan and their sympathizers will read it to learn the identity of those persons for whom they do not blush to sell out America.

What to do with Your Money?

THE Lehman corporation, large New York investment trust, is definitely on the inside track of the Roosevelt Administration.

One of the Lehmans is Governor of New York State.

Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, is married into the Lehman family.

These two items are cited to support the statement that they are insiders.

Recently, the Lehman corporation issued its annual report (year ending June 30) revealing what this corporation is doing with its money.

As of June 30, there were 2,003,377 shares outstanding in the corporation valued at $28.77 a share.

72.5 per cent of the corporation's gross assets were invested in common stocks at the end of last month.

Cash, receivables, and United States government obligations comprised only 15.1 per cent of the corporation's assets.

* * *

These figures indicate that the Lehman brothers believe in holding very few government bonds and very little cash in their vaults.

These figures indicate that the Lehman brothers believe in owning things or shares in corporations.

Recently, Lehman Brothers added 1,000 shares of Goodyear Tire and Rubber, 4,500 shares of National City Bank of New York, 2,500 shares of American Radiator and Standard Sanitary, 1,700 shares of Climax Molybdenum.

On the other hand, Lehman Brothers sold shares of American Power and Light and 2,060 shares of Chicago Great Western 5 per cent preferred.

Decreases were also made in holdings of United Aircraft, Texas Gulf Sulphur, Commonwealth, Edison, and Pullman common stocks, as well as 2,000 American Telephone and Telegraph shares.

On analysis, these figures indicate that Lehman Brothers have lost some appreciation for public utility stock, possibly because the directors of the corporation are of the opinion that these public utilities will be nationalized.

What are you going to do with your money?

In so far as you are no Lehman corporation and no insider, are you going to buy Government bonds? Are you going to keep your money in cash, or in public utility stocks? Or do you intend to buy things — common stocks, a piece of good real estate, canned goods, underwear, shoes, staples?

We are glad to pass on the information to you relative to the Lehman Brothers.

They know.

Revelry by Night

DREW PEARSON and Bob Allen are the twin journalists who perform the same chores for Mr. Roosevelt which Virginio Guyda does for Il Duce Mussolini.

Generally, they know what they are talking about. Generally, they reflect what is going on inside the White House.

Recently — under the caption "French Lesson" these twin journalists disclosed to the world, unconsciously, what goes on within the inner circle of the war-mongering politicians while the outer circle of working men, farmers, housewives and children are trembling lest hell breaks loose in America.

Pearson and Allen said:

"During the nine months between the beginning of the war in September, 1939, and the fall of France in June, 1940, some of the gayest parties since the days of Napoleon III featured the social life of Paris.

"Feeling completely safe behind the Maginot Line, many Parisians entertained as never before. Some of them even rented villas and ducal estates from the old French nobility and did them over merely to give one party for one night.

"Nobody seemed to worry about what happened in the front lines.

"Last week one of the most lavish debutante parties in years was given by the former U. S. Ambassador to France, William C. Bullitt, for his daughter. A special airport was arranged on his country estate outside Philadelphia for airplanes bringing guests.

"Three imported orchestras jazzed out dance music from various corners of the estate. Snow-white swans glided on a moonlit pond. Spotlights played down upon giant blue china frogs.

"EIGHT CHAMPAGNE BARS WERE LOCATED OVER HIS ACRES SO THAT NO MATTER WHERE HIS GUESTS STROLLED THEY WOULD NOT BE WITHOUT A DRINK.

"It was an occasion which the United States may not see again in a long time."

* * *

Never in the life of any reader of this publication — as far as we know — has one attended a party anything like the one described by Pearson and Allen.

That is the crowd of Marxists, refugees, left-wing internationalists who enjoy the cream of the country and want the rest of us to go on milkless, butterless, cheeseless days while they guzzle champagne.

When will the American people wake up to recognize that Bill Bullitt and the racialists whom he represents, are toying with our rights, our prosperity and our lives?

No so long ago at San Francisco, Charles Lindbergh said: "The refugees from Europe, when they land in this country, come out for our intervention and are acclaimed heroes by the New Dealers — whereas an American-born citizen who comes out for peace is called a fifth columnist."

No wonder the Bullitts, the Fairbanks, the refugees and the champagne guzzlers belong to the Defend America Committee!

What they really mean, is defend their privileges; defend their power over both political parties; defend their graft; defend their international subversive society which has ruined civilization.

It is high time for Americans to get wise.

Can Christianity Work?

Reforms Fail Under a 'Controlled' Democracy

THE FIRST World War marked the birth date of a book entitled "The Anvil of War" by F. S. Oliver, an Englishman.

The author permitted himself to indulge in certain predictions which ran counter to the political philosophy of the day.

Although the war was being fought, so the current propaganda said, "to make the world safe for democracy," yet the informed people knew better.

Indeed, they knew venal politicians had surrendered their souls to a system of exploitation operated by bankers, monopolists and internationalists who, through their pound sterling and dollar power, had gained control of the nations of the world — a control operated for the welfare of the few and to the detriment of the many.

From this political labyrinth the people wanted to be led.

On page 133 of "The Anvil of War" Mr. Oliver wrote: "What is going to happen to us all and to the world after this war is over? . . . It seems to me that it depends very much on guid — on what Carlyle called 'Kingship.' If we are lucky enough to fall upon someone who can and will rule, either by his ideas or by himself wielding the power of the State, I think that it will be a better world than it has ever been, and we shall all be a better people. We shall see things more clearly, stripped of cant and phrases. Also we shall understand one another better — the different classes, races and even the nations of the world. On the other hand, without that guidance we are not at all unlikely to be at one another's throat and to have a bloody revolution."

* * *

Thus, a few days after the second Christmas of the first World War, Mr. Oliver was predicting the bloody world-wide revolution which now is upon us.

At the time his prediction was made, however, it appeared to be unlikely of fulfilment; for the world — according to newspaper men and political propagandists — was being made safe for democracy. Yet, within the span of a single generation every major country in Europe, with the exception of Great Britain and France, had adopted in one form or another a system of government based on personal dictatorship.

When Mr. Oliver was engaged in typing the pages of "The Anvil of War," the future dictator of Russia was a hunted exile; the future dictator of Italy was an inferior officer of the Italian army; the future dictator of Germany was running dispatches amid the shell-holes of war-torn France.

Within four years from the end of the first World War, two of these three men succeeded in achieving Napoleonic power. The third, Adolf Hitler, was still standing on a lower rung of the ladder which since he has climbed.

* * *

Since the birth of democracy, particularly, the Christian Church — both Catholic and Protestant — had not acted very vigorously against the social, political and economic abuses of the day.

Truly, in 1884, Leo XIII wrote and distributed his most pointed encyclical on the root causes which effected the regimentation of races. Definitely, he called attention to the existence of a small group of hidden concentrationists whose members had regimented mankind.

Insufficient attention was given to Leo's pronouncements in the pulpits of Christendom, for many bishops and priests, fearing lest they be accused of bigotry, contented themselves in applying the Pontiff's words and warnings to localities and countries other than their own.

Again in 1891 the same Pontiff, in a more understandable manner, appealed to Christendom to free the democratic peoples from the economic slavery which this world-wide group of subversive internationalists had imposed upon mankind.

But from that time until our day few churchmen had much to say about the causes of the democratic world evils so ably diagnosed in 1884.

* * *

This statement is made while remembering the valuable pronouncements made by Pius XI in 1931; while remembering the vigorous attempts to liquidate want amidst plenty by patriots and clergymen who were content to operate within the framework of the controlled democracy in which we live.

That was the difficulty, namely, ***trying to remedy the situation inside the frame of "controlled democracy."***

As a result, the hungry sheep looked up and were not fed. They were handed stones instead of bread. They were organized in political parties, trade unions and vertical unions only to find their organizations surrendering them to the chieftains of the same politicians who led them to the slaughter in 1939.

Tweedledum and Tweedledee were both regulated and dominated by the back-stage group mentioned by Leo XIII in 1884. Democracy was nothing more than a catch word when it was seen that a handful of unelected internationalists bossed Republican and Democrat and Socialist alike.

And what of the churchmen?

Is it that churchmen, being able to educate and satisfy religious hunger, evade it?

Is it that churchmen are scared to death lest their sources of financial support be withdrawn?

Or, are they ignorant of the identity of those who rule the political, financial and social world under the protecting veil of "democracy"?

* * *

It is indubitably true that, for the time being, churchmen have failed. Though it appears that the consciousness of churchmen is of the same texture as that of the consciousness of the secular leaders who surround them and in which they are impeded, yet the truth is that churchmen have been too tolerant, too trusting, too credulous. Not enough attention did they pay to Leo's document of 1884.

In his book entitled, "The Betrayal of Christ by the Churches" (it were better called "The Betrayal of Christ by the Churchmen"), the able Englishman, J. Middleton Murry, writes:

"Take, for example, two very different forms in which the latent religious consciousness of Englishmen has been expressed. There has been for years a widespread feeling . . . that the Treaty of Versailles was radically unjust . . . There was a widespread desire that the Treaty should be publicly repudiated by this nation, and a fairly general presentiment that unless there were such a repudiation there would be a grim retribution.

"At the time the Treaty was made, the Church was completely silent. As far as I can remember . . . no voice of any high religious authority was heard in protest . . . But why be silent? Is it part of the modern theory of Christianity that it must never lift its voice against the act of a democratic government?"

* * *

Astute churchmen should have protested against the contents of the Treaty. They should have demanded a place at the Versailles table. They should have condemned at the outset the presence of Clemenceau. Better still, French churchmen should have organized their people long before the first World War to ostracize Clemenceau and his supporters from public life. Unfortunately, they were afraid of a bogus "democracy."

One is apt to recollect, in connection with this, the memorable struggle made by blessed Bernardino a Feltre who dedicated his life to oppose the usurers of his day.

Leo X reigned on the papal throne. His brother, Lorenzo de Medici, dominated the destinies of Florence. Leo X permitted the practice of usury both by Christians and Jews resident within the precincts of the papal states. And usury, as it manifested itself at that time, insisted not only in lending gold at exorbitant rates of interest but in lending receipts for gold which did not exist.

Finally, blessed Bernardino a Feltre persuaded Leo X to forbid Christians, if not Jews, to participate in this immorality.

Armed with this papal edict, Bernardino hastened to Florence to persuade Lorenzo de Medici to desist from his unjust practice. The princely ruler was unable to contest the arguments of the saint. To sustain his unjust practice of usury, he exclaimed: "I am not a Christian. I am a Jew!"

* * *

It appears that, since the days of Leo X, too many of our ecclesiastics have adopted the argument of Lorenzo de Medici, having streamlined it to suit the times. They are loud in affirming that, for example, they are Britishers; that, for example, they are Americans. As such, they find themselves supporting the political, subversive Lorenzo de Medicis of these, our days.

In Leo X's time there was taught the theory that trade, commerce, industry and civilization could not be sustained without practicing the usury of the day. Bernardino a Feltre, John of Capistrano and other fearless clerics were discredited when they asserted that a civilization built upon a patent immorality was detrimental of God's little children.

One need not draw the parallel when so many Christians at this period of the second World War entertain the thought that Christianity cannot endure unless it is wedded to the theory of a bogus democ-

(Continued on Page 13)

Comment

(Continued from Page 12)

racy which is controlled by the forces so ably described by Leo XIII in his document published in 1884.

Currently, democracy is presented to us as a sort of world-wide religion where the lion sits down with the lamb in perfect accord. It is regarded as a universal religion wherein the various creeds manifest a pacific tolerance one towards the other. It is described as an international religion whose fervor will melt the artificial boundaries of nationality. It is lauded by propagandists, war-mongers, politicians, monopolists and financiers not for the benefit of the masses whose properties are confiscated, but for the aggrandizement of the classes whose privileges are protected.

Even godless Russia is welcomed into its charmed circle.

As a result, extreme Catholicism has been demoted in favor of extreme democracy.

7 7 7

Thus it is that Christianity has come to occupy the merest corner in the mind of contemporary society. It is the affair, too often, of professionals whose real occupation is to try to make people feel good when the realities of the situation demand that they should feel bad.

Yet the simple fact is that modern events clamor for a Christian interpretation; for courageous Christian intervention.

The economic interpretation to the effect that "if not Communism, then capitalism," is basically erroneous. It is tantamount to our saying, "if not steam, then ice." The middleground, the Christian ground of cooling water, is disregarded. And the middle ground between capitalism and Communism; between bogus democracy and godless dictatorship, is Christian social justice.

We mean a Christian social justice that recognizes Christ as King; a Christian social justice that recognizes a corporative state in which every worker receives a living, annual, family wage; a Christian social justice in which nations are engaged in producing for peace and not far war; a Christian social justice in which there is a hierarchic form of government based upon excellency of intelligence rather than upon crudity of numbers; a Christian social justice in which man is regarded as something more than a preacher of economic interests, for he is a brother of Christ.

7 7 7

Possibly churchmen do not appreciate the infinite power entrusted to them by Jesus Christ — a power sustained by the Holy Spirit, the Father of the poor.

The Master once said that if we had as much faith as a grain of mustard seed, we could move mountains.

Possibly many churchmen forget that the Church grows strong only by opposition, by non-conformity.

Christ was an oppositionist.

Christ was a non-conformist.

As such, He patterned the way for those now inclined to conform with things as they are.

Indeed, the Church grows strong by opposition and also by faith in its King and Divine Strengthener Who is the soul of the Church.

If churchmen really believed, passionately, in their divine appointment and mission, they would have the courage that must inevitably come of such a sense of divine authority. They would dare indict corrupt democracy as well as corrupt dictatorships.

They would dare remember, for example, the Treaty of Versailles imposed by the corrupt democracies upon Germany.

They would dare indict nations and statesmen for their manifest transgressions of the laws of God in America and in Britain as well as in Germany.

They would dare to do these things. But they have so long ceased even to dream of doing these things, having submerged themselves in many instances beneath the strata of the international politicians, bankers and monopolists, that they dare shout for war or remain silent by not condemning a war that scourges the world — a war stemming from those groups indicted so ably by Leo XIII in 1884.

Continue Supporting Wheeler, Lindbergh

NO MATTER what certain individuals in the America First Committee say, it will be our practiced policy to support Senator Wheeler and ex-Col. Chas. A. Lindbergh in their courageous attempt to keep America out of a shooting war.

Several weeks ago we warned our readers and friends that they should make no attempt to dominate the America First Committee and we pleaded with all other groups to make no attempt to dominate that committee.

As far as the America First Committee is concerned, we regard it as nothing more than a forum for both Messrs. Wheeler and Lindbergh.

The sentiment in America is definitely against war. American opinion is definitely on the side of the Senator and the ex-Colonel who, despite our entrance into war, must be supported; for to them, following the war, will we look for leadership.

Incidentally, our contemporary, the *Ave Maria,* throws a ray of light upon a dark spot produced by the interventionist magazine *Life,* relative to the debate of war vs. peace.

Said the *Ave Maria:*

"When the *Life* (interventionist) magazine revealed a newspaper poll of a typical American city (Neosho, Mo.) to be overwhelmingly in favor of war, the America First committee doubted the magazine's veracity, and subsequently polled every adult whose name appeared in the directory. Returns revealed 27.7 per cent voted for intervention, while 69.6 per cent opposed it. How to account for the startling difference in the results? If there was not dishonesty in the matter, then the cause must be laid to the manner of framing the question, as we gather from the letter of a Gallup poll taker in Montana — a college graduate — who says in part: 'The important questions concerning foreign policy are so framed that the person interviewed is almost forced to give an answer consistent with the Roosevelt policy." This is a serious charge leveled at both *Life* and the Gallup organization. If these agencies are nothing more than propaganda machines, well and good; for it is no crime here in America to be guilty of propaganda. But it is a far different matter, and not so honorable, to hide mere propaganda under the cloak of popular opinion, to distort the facts involved, and thus to deprive the American people of that true public opinion of the majority which they have a right to know. Just as this is written the Citizens-Keep-America-out-of-War committee, of which Mr. William P. Grace of Chicago is chairman, is projecting a poll which will reach 5-million voters. Five questions covering issues of all-out war effort, convoying, repeal of the neutrality act, war referendum, and an effort by President Roosevelt to bring about peace are printed in the submission slip. The wording of the questions are direct, and free from evasiveness. The result, if the voters co-operate, should indicate the attitude of the American people toward participation in the European war."

'Machiavelli-and-Soda'

SIR ROBERT VANSITTART, former chief diplomatic advisor to the British Government, is nicknamed "Machiavelli-and-soda" by his cronies.

Recently Sir Robert wrote a book called "Black Record." All it did was blame all the the wars of the last two centuries on the congenital barbarism of the German race.

"Machiavelli-and-soda" so effervesced with racial hatred in this book that the English liberal magazine *The New Statesman and Nation* assailed Vansittart for "deflecting into the channel of racial hatred the emotions that should inspire us in this struggle" — and pointed out that the English were also of Teutonic origin.

But what *The New Statesman and Nation* missed in "Black Record" is the fact that all the crimes and evils Vansittart lays at the door of the German nation apply equally to Great Britain.

Here are a few quotes from "Black Record," with their British counterparts added:

"Not content with dominating Europe, he (Hitler) must dominate the seas."

Britain already dominates the seas and fights the present war to retain domination over Europe.

"And bad taste and hard drinking were accordingly a vertible passport to success in Imperial Germany."

It is pretty well known that Sir Robert and his statesmen compatriots don't always take Machiavelli with their soda.

Germany "has impaled on its blackhorns Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Luxemburg, Holland, Belgium and France."

England has impaled on its bloody sword of freedom Ireland, India, Egypt, Iraq and most of Africa.

For proof of German atrocities "read the Polish Black Book."

For proof of British atrocities read the Egyptian White Book exposing English barbarism in 1919; also any informed source on England's record in Ireland.

" 'These slaves will by no means be denied the blessings of illiteracy,' says Herr Darre, the German Minister of Agriculture."

British slaves likewise are blessed with illiteracy: in Egypt and Iraq (colonies in all but name) almost 90 per cent of the people are illiterate.

And, according to Sir Robert, the devilish spirit which drove the Germans to such barbarisms as the above was "envy" — envy of the British Empire.

Letters

SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.

Appeal to Christians

TO THE EDITOR:

At last the cat was cut loose and he is red. Mr. Roosevelt orders all aid for Russia. Now we know why the Administration has been so lenient towards Mr. Stalin and his agents. The Christian people of America are to be burdened with taxes, and if necessary, shed their blood so that Communism will not alone be saved in Europe, but put in position to dominate there.

They will tell you it is most necessary to do so because of Hitler; but why was there so much sympathy and aid given to the so-called Loyalists in Spain who were Communists before Hitler's time? Ah, yes, we know.

Well, Christian leaders, it is up to you now to take your stand with Father Coughlin and with his principles; you are being gradually forced into a position where you will be compelled to pay for your own execution. Demand of those who are supposed to represent the people to do their duty under the Constitution first, last and all the time for these United States; if they do not, what are they there for, and why wait until election time to fire them? It is because of their neglecting their duties that the country is in such a state today. If people do not wake up, it is firing squads instead of F.B.I. men.

—M.J.C.

Avenal, Calif.

A Post Card a Day

TO THE EDITOR:

I am organizing a post card drive to protest the terrible unpreparedness of our army, its desperate need for armored tanks, combat planes, bombers, anti-aircraft guns and other arms.

The western hemisphere is our domain. From Alaska to Labrador, from the Hawaiian Islands to Bermuda, from Canada to South America. These are the outposts of the United States. We must allow no invading army to set foot on it.

It is asked of those Americans who love their country enough to want their army prepared to defend it to send one post card a day to inform the President that our army needs the planes, tanks and guns now being turned out from our American factories.

If we are to be taxed for defense, let's make it for American defense and not for financing a foreign war.

A post card a day to keep war away!

—J.L.F.

New York City

Suggestions for N.C.W.C.

TO THE EDITOR:

Having read from cover to cover the issue of the 28th of June, it occurs to me that the centuries will have much food for thought.

When Father Coughlin was denied the privilege of broadcasting the much needed truth, it was in order for the "National Catholic Welfare Council" to have met and to have adopted the following resolution:

"The members of the National Catholic Welfare Council unanimously approve and endorse the principles of social justice, as proclaimed and explained and maintained by the Rev. Charles E. Coughlin of Royal Oak, Michigan."

The release of this resolution to the Associated Press would have saved an opportunity which will not return and would have been a worthy, needed, and timely service to the cause of Christ and His followers.

"Oh! Justice thou hast fled to brutish Beasts" and holy men ignore their reason.

—J.D.R.

W. Roxbury, Mass.

Consumer Co-Ops and the Church

TO THE EDITOR:

A letter in SOCIAL JUSTICE, Jan. 20, 1941, stated: "The Catholic Church officially and repeatedly has not only indorsed, but promoted Consumer Cooperation without any qualifications whatsoever."

That statement is false; it is in error on several points. One is this: In economics the Catholic Church supports moral principles but it does not support any particular application of such principles. Note these words from the (U.S.) Bishops Program, 1940, paragraphs 9 and 10:

"First, let it be made clear that the Church is concerned only with the moral aspects of trade and industry and does not enter the field of business in matters that are purely material or technical. The Church is not concerned with the accuracy of economic surveys or the resultant data, nor with the problems of scientific organization, production, cost-accounting, transportation, marketing and a multitude of similar activities. To pass judgment on their aptitude and merits is a technical problem proper to economic science and business administration. For such the Church has neither the equipment nor the authorization. We frankly declare that it would be unwise on her part to discuss their operation except insofar as a moral interest might be involved.

"The Church does not prescribe any particular form of technical economic organization of society just as she does not prescribe any particular political organization of the state."

Since the Consumer Co-op movement is a producing and marketing organization, we might well repeat the Bishops' words: "The Church is not concerned . . . with the problems of scientific organization, production, transportation, marketing, etc. . . ." Thus we see that the Church does not officially promote any particular system of production and marketing. On the other hand, the basic moral principles of the Church can be applied in numerous ways.

Now let us compare a few Catholic economic principles with the philosophy of the consumer co-op movement:

(a) The Church supports individual ownership of productive property as widespread as is reasonably possible. In contrast the Consumer co-ops seek to absorb individual ownership into a giant collectivist system of chain stores and monopolies.

(b) The Church supports the principle that capital is entitled to a modest income. In contrast the consumer co-ops are opposed to profit: by which is meant that ultimately (not immediately) the consumer co-ops seek a system in which income on capital investment will disappear.

(c) The Church recognizes the fundamental rights and duties of the economic classes, and seeks cooperation between the classes. In contrast the Consumer Co-op movement teaches that economic classes are separated by fundamental antagonisms, and it seeks to solve the problem by setting up a classless society of consumers which will control production, distribution and raw material supplies; thus the producer, distributor and the consumer will be the same persons in the Consumer Co-op system. In plain words this is called: 'Consumer Socialism.'

There are many other differences between Catholic principles and those of the Consumer Co-ops — too many for a short letter.

In rebuttal someone may wish to point out that the Bishops' Program for 1919 advocated the Consumer Co-ops. However, if you will read paragraph 9 of the Bishops' Program of 1940 you will note that such action is termed "unwise" and that the Church has "neither the equipment nor the authorization" to do this. Since 1919, we have the aid of the guiding light of the encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno. Furthermore, we now have a better understanding of the aims of the Consumer Co-op movement. The latter we must reject.

—F.A.G.

Cincinnati, Ohio

Noah Was an Isolationist and Scripture Commended Him

TO THE EDITOR:

Once a great, good man named Noah was warned that devastating floods were coming. He was warned to get "prepared" by building a large, sturdy ark. It was to be well stocked with nourishing supplies—enough to keep "Noahites" well and strong, and united during the world deluge.

Noah, a wise man, was to save himself, his own family, and plenty of livestock. He was to be prudent, remain calm as it was up to him and his to create a new, brave world—after the deluge. The new world was to be based on love of God and the *Ten Commandments.*

Obviously, Noah figured he couldn't save himself and his kin and remain strong, if he tried to save everyone else—after the rains came. He, possibly, warned them beforehand of impending disaster but they sneered — called him a long-faced, serious old duck, afraid to face the gay future with them of a free, unrestrained brotherhood, dancing together to Utopia to the tune of the international jitterbug band.

Noah was the first known "isolationist." Although approved by God, there's no doubt the floating population, disappointed when he refused (or did he?) "bundles" of food, yelled "Selfish, shortsighted isolationist and copperhead!" No doubt his heart was troubled even while planning for the future world he was assigned to create.

What did Noah do when some tender family member wanted to toss out "bundles" for the hungry, cold floaters-by? Why did a just God approve of him clinging tenaciously to his own hard-earned possessions instead of lowering huge baskets filled with precious goods?

Was Noah selfish to figure that by so doing, his own family might become hungry or weakened—or that by taking in hordes of refugees (some clinging to their precious jewels) his own boat might become over-crowded, diseased, filled with panic, dissension and famine?

Would the rescued floaters-by, if saved, have appreciated this gesture of universal brotherly love and have meekly helped Noah (if he survived) create the new world of peace and love and justice? Or were their past records against them, so to speak?

Lastly, what if Noah, too, had gaily waited until the floods came to hastily construct his own ark? And then, before the edifice was completed, had, in tenderness and mercy for others, ripped off the boards as fast as he nailed them on to toss to the struggling brethren floating by with pitiful pleas for aid?

That Noah was an isolationist—yes! But was he wise and sensible —or selfish? If he was selfish, why did God approve of him and why have good people of every century sung his praises as the good man who heeded divine warning, prepared for trouble ahead, looked after his own — then, midst the wreckage, led his family and animals from the ark and created a new world? Is it logical to commend Isolationist Noah and condemn today's isolationist?

—Mrs. I.L.

Denver, Colo.

Letters

Has Not Succumbed to Invasion Propaganda

TO THE EDITOR:

The following is long. So is the effort of the interventionist to involve our beloved country in an alien war. I hope you will find place to insert this in your paper in the interest of tracing the illogical progress of those who reason that this is our war.

The opposition tact of the interventionist used to be a scare story of military invasion. Air invasion from bases at short radius is decidedly uncomfortable but apparently requires a considerable time for success in England. Air invasion from bases at remote distances from United States is highly untenable. To our north the severity of the elements is a natural defense. To our south, the proximity of Pernambuco to Dakar is only one gap in a discussed invasion route. The others are difficult if not impossible barriers.

Recall that geographically by such proposed route the total distance from Berlin to Dakar is 3,325 miles, thence to Pernambuco 1,600 miles, all by water. From Pernambuco to Bogota is 3,100 miles, thence through the isthmus to the Texas border is 2,200 miles, all by land. None of these 10,225 miles is continuous passage over or through a homogenous element of people, allegiance, air or terrain. Such invasion supposes absurd hypotheses.

Now that the southern route has been demonstrated untenable to the legend bearers, they try a northern fear route.

Some elementary facts of geography are interesting in regard to Greenland. The coast is rocky, and fringed with bays and narrow fog-filled fjords. During the brief Arctic summer the coast region has grass and flowers. The trees are bushlike, never large enough to provide timber or fuel. All wood for construction purposes must be brought to the island. Within the mountains back of the coast lies a plateau of ice so thick that, if spread over the entire United States it would form a covering one-quarter mile deep. However, if there was any danger of invasion from Greenland, it has been eliminated by action of our Government.

There remains one more geographical fear offensive for the propaganda of intervention.

Such has been projected briefly from time to time — namely, the Far East. From San Francisco to Japan by way of Midway, Wake, Guam and the Philippines is 12,390 miles, the Philippines lying 2,000 miles to the south of Japan.

The argument of "economic penetration" has been reduced to the absurd. About 10% of our total trade is with foreign sources. We could have had more long ago if we had wished to remove discriminating trade barriers.

Let us suppose, absurdly, that we lose all of this present foreign trade. Wouldn't that still be better than war, national anarchy, ruin, death and a tax of 50% — about 20% of which is directly proposed now while we are not totally participating?

The non-interventionist doesn't need fabled stories of Sargasso grass seed planted about the coast to ensnare lurking submarines, nor shall we cement the bottom of the ocean so that invaders by tunnel cannot dig through nor exhaust the air so that planes cannot penetrate the vacuum.

The nation is fortified by natural geographical advantages. Internally it is not, and the cause is lack of sympathy with those who try to make us forget Washington, Adams, Madison and the stuff of internal courage and independence such as has built the United States.

—C.M.S.

Chelsea, Mass.

Not a 'Coughlinite'

TO THE EDITOR:

Because of the comments in the back page of the July 7 issue I suppose (being a staunch America First-ite) I should ask you to cancel my subscription to SOCIAL JUSTICE.

However, I subscribe to SOCIAL JUSTICE not because I am a Coughlinite — I am not — or because I am anti-Semitic — I am not (neither am I Jewish or Communist) but because I am against American intervention in the war. As far as that goes I think SOCIAL JUSTICE is tops.

The one most important and only issue that we should pull together on and throw all our energy into at present is to keep the United States out of war. I might add that when Senator Reynolds spoke at an anti-war rally in New York, his paper was not permitted to be sold in the building.

Religious or any other interests must not limit America First's scope. If you believe in and want to keep "America First" you should place it above pettiness.

— Mrs. K.W.W.

Flushing, N. Y.

Betrayed by Farm Bureau

TO THE EDITOR:

It is important that the farmers of the United States should be advised that the Grange and the Farm Bureau are being used to shepherd them along and keep them from attacking the private money racket, known as "The Federal Reserve Bank."

The Farm Bureau was organized after a conference of the American Bankers Assn., as a means of backfiring against the Farmers Union, in the West, that was demanding a return to constitutional money.

The Ohio Farm Bureau was organized on that plan by Myron T. Herrick, who was President of the largest bank in Cleveland, and an employee of that bank was loaned to the Farm Bureau to become its secretary, a post that he still holds after 23 years.

That the Ohio Farm Bureau is being led by men unworthy of confidence and respect, my experience with them seems to justify.

After 21 years of membership I was ruined, and my credit put on a blacklist so that I was not able to buy stock to feed, even though a Government examiner, who looked over my inventory, said I should be able to borrow $2500 on my unimpaired personal assets; and besides, I had an equity of several thousand dollars in my farm of 202 acres, and a record of paying many thousands of feeder loans promptly.

I fell from grace when I brought 105 of Gertrude Coogan's "*Money Creators*" into the county to sell at cost.

I had borrowed $7800 from the Farm Bureau Credit Corp. in '37 after Roosevelt had said the depression was over, and bought new stock and machinery, putting in $2350 of cash besides.

After $5,500 of the borrowed principal had been repaid, from products sold in the new depression, the Farm Bureau swooped down on me and sold my 8 horses and 230 young corriedale ewes for a fraction of their worth, and imported and registered rams for as little as $2.

That is what you call paying through the nose.

I still have an idle farm and a silo filled with alfalfa in 1938, and I am still a member of the Farm Bureau in good standing.

It is time the farm organizations begin to look their "gift horses" in the mouth — to say nothing of their "Trojan horses."

— D.B.H.

Mantua, Ohio

Shake Hands With the Devil

THE HAND THAT DESTROYED THE HOUSES OF WORSHIP···
··AND SLEW THE LEADERS OF RELIGION IN RUSSIA
THE HAND THAT LIQUIDATED THE UKRAINIANS··
··AND MASSACRED THE HELPLESS POLES·· AND THE WOMEN AND CHILDREN OF FINLAND
THAT IS THE HAND WE ARE ASKED TO CLASP IN COMRADESHIP TO SAVE "WORLD DEMOCRACY"
WAR MONGER
RED RUSSIA
+L.E.A.
ORR

Encouragement

TO THE EDITOR:

As an old SOCIAL JUSTICE worker I am writing you to offer a word of encouragement at this time, for the great work SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine is doing against terrific odds and also on the high calibre of the most of the matter which appears.

With best wishes for continued and greater success.

—J.P.K.

Richmond Hill, N. Y.

How Big is a Billion!

TO THE EDITOR:

Here is one grand way to make one realize what $1-billion really amounts to:

It is now only a little over one billion minutes since Jesus Christ was hung on the cross on Calvary Hill.

It is easy to figure out, if one doubts it:

60 minutes equals 1 hour;

24 hours equals 1 day, or 1,440 minutes;

365 days equals 1 year, or 525,600 minutes;

1941 x 525,600 equals 1,020,189,600 minutes since Christ was crucified.

—J.B.B.

Cleveland, Ohio

Comment

Los Angeles Out For Britain Now

LOS ANGELES — where almost any new, sensational idea stands a fair chance of being tried on for size — now has the *Southern California Committee for Federal Union*, a group favoring American union with Great Britain and her dominions.

Los Angeles is used to "movements."

The Townsend Plan, it may be recalled, was born in Los Angeles. Likewise, its rival, "Ham and Eggs," or "$30 Every Thursday," also first saw the light of day there.

Although Technocracy was not a local product it was received enthusiastically.

Father Divine had bigger and better "heavens" and more "angels" in Los Angeles than in any other city save Gotham itself.

The Ballards, organizers of the "I Am" cult, found Los Angeles in such a receptive mood that earnings of the founders were subjected to court scrutiny.

And where but in Los Angeles would one find an Aimee Semple McPherson, the Four Square Gospel girl who was capable of such remarkable feats as disappearing into the ocean and reappearing some time later in the desert?

Considering this background, it is not surprising that a Federal Union organization is sprouting in the environs of Los Angeles.

The first meeting of the enterprising Anglophiles took the form of a dinner party at the fashionable Beverly Hills hotel, with nearly a thousand society folks, educators and screen stars present. Basil Rathbone, film actor, presided.

Two Nobel prize winners, Dr. Robert A. Millikin, president of the California Institute of Technology, and Thomas Mann, refugee German writer, were speakers.

Mr. Mann, who said that Winston Churchill is an ardent supporter of Federal Union, believes that American union with Great Britain is the "only salvation for democracy."

Dr. Millikin spoke of "isolationist fallacies," and painted a dark picture of America's future if this nation does not join the British Empire quickly.

"If the democratic, peace-loving peoples have not enough intelligence to unite their forces, then they all will be destroyed and mankind will revert to the life of the jungle," he asserted.

He sought to show that real sentiment in America is overwhelmingly in favor of intervention, but after employing *Gallup poll* figures to support his argument he failed to point out how the young men who will have to fight feel about American entrance into war.

He said, for example, that 68 per cent of Americans — according to the *Gallup poll* — are willing to aid England even to the point of risking war. He stressed also the large number of distinguished educators, including many on the faculty of the college he heads, who are favorable to convoys and war.

But Dr. Millikin did not mention that polls of young men at universities are, for the most part, opposed to war. He did not mention that a poll of students at his own institution showed 60 per cent against convoys, against war and against a union of English-speaking nations!

At the time the poll was taken Dr. Millikin was quoted as saying that it did not represent student opinion because only one-third of the student body voted. He questioned, furthermore, the method of polling.

That appears to be strange reasoning for a man who places so much credence in the *Gallup poll*, which does not even pretend to record the vote of all Americans, but only a sampling percentage of a chosen few.

Dr. Millikin might be interested in another recent poll of student opinion — at Los Angeles City College. Results were much the same as those at California Institute of Technology. To the question "Should America enter the war?" 92 per cent answered no; 65.7 per cent were opposed to convoys; 97 per cent to selling war materials to Japan; and 93 per cent to sending war materials to Soviet Russia.

But this merely represents the opinion of boys who would have to fight the war. Educators, who will remain at home, are quite belligerent.

Latest of the group of bellicose savants are 63 members of the faculty of the University of California at Los Angeles, commonly known as U.C.L.A.

These gentlemen have formed the *Temporary Committee of Faculty Members for the Defense of Democracy*. They sent a telegram to President Roosevelt expressing confidence in his leadership and urging "that every step be taken to assure delivery of war materials to Britain and her Allies."

It may be a meaningless sidelight, but none of the dozen U.C.L.A. faculty members who recently went into military service signed the war telegram.

Without impugning any motives of high patriotism, it is not uncharitable to point out, in Dr. Millikin's case, that much of the wealth of his institution's most generous patron, the late Seeley W. Mudd, has come from huge copper and gold interests on the Island of Cyprus, a British dependency.

In his memory, Mrs. Seeley W. Mudd erected a laboratory of geological sciences at California Institute of Technology. Another member of the family, Dr. Seeley G. Mudd, is a professor at the college; while Harvey S. Mudd, a trustee of the institution, is administering certain business affairs of the estate.

Recently he was advised by his general manager in Cyprus that the mining property had been bombed by Italians and that profitable operations have been severely curtailed.

The Panacea Crop

THE WEEK's editorial mail has been enlivened by Vol. I, No. 1 of *Debt, Inc.*, "dedicated to the defeat of Socialism," published at Monette, Washington. The editor is Lambert Schuyler, author of *"Think Fast America."* His spirited style and his grasp of what is going on about him is indicated by the following quotation, which he titles *"The Panacea Crop."*

Says the editorial:

"There are an estimated 7,642 men in the United States who have developed formulas for the salvation of the world to the point of breaking into print. Postmen everywhere are lugging to and fro manuscripts that profess to have the final answer and now, after all these years of stabilized depression, the people willing to read these weighty works have become so scarce that the writers have taken to sending them to each other.

"Men of prominence, of course, lose no time over them and even their secretaries have taken to throwing them violently into wastebaskets. Even Mr. Hoover, who as late as six years ago was still offering six bits apiece for good panaceas, has given up the quest and has gone back to the problem of feeding foreigners.

"Meanwhile, the world spins merrily on its way to hell and the panacea writers are becoming bitter and introspective.

* * *

"But it happens that some of us are very worried over the whole mess. For some years we sat back and did nothing, confident that the big shots, the men with a corner on brains, would find the answer without difficulty. And we were comforted further by being told that these smart people were being put to work not singly or in pairs; they were being harnessed in teams like the mules that used to haul borax. 'Many heads are better than one,' we told each other, forgetting that the mule's reputation was built up at the other end.

"And so we find now that grey matter *en masse* has produced nothing of value. The idea factories of the New Deal, the Brookings Institute, the Twentieth Century Fund, the Sloane Foundation and the like have stuffed many volumes which, in turn, have stuffed without charge the office shelves of every Congressman in Washington, all without practical results.

"Socialism, the real foe of civilization, has received by these efforts more help than hindrance and therefore things are getting worse.

"Now comes the smoke screen.

"America has gone into the war business and suddenly we no longer need recovery because the war boom is providing it. We are faced with a strange contradiction. The war, which grew out of unemployment and the disruption of trade, itself provides employment and stimulates production and consumption. The poison seems to provide its own antidote.

* * *

"Actually, we who have our eyes open know that the war is but another phase of the destructive process which our civilization is undergoing. No good can come out of it.

"If we have any sense whatever we should look forward to the end of the war with the greatest foreboding. The same troubles that we have failed to solve so outstandingly in the decade past will be with us again in aggravated form. The real crisis will come then.

"Of course, the New Deal will have another flannel-throated fireside formula ready by then but even that financial monstrosity must have its timely end. It cannot go on borrowing forever. And when the Federal Reserve, that fountain-head of a socialist experimentation, runs out of what it takes, what power will be left in a mere silken voice?

"The fat will be in the fire *and we know it.*"

Comment

Those Polls of Public Opinion

POLLS of public opinion are interesting — not necessarily factual, but interesting.

They may or may not present a true picture of sentiment on this and that, but they often do serve to create the opinion they profess to report.

Helen Essary, a Washington *Times-Herald* reporter, claims she had the almost unparalleled experience of — no, not meeting anyone who had ever been questioned by the Gallup Poll— but the experience of talking with a Gallup poller.

In reply to her queries the poller said he/she did not choose at random those whom he/she questioned, but was given the names of 15 persons to interview.

"What sort of people?" Miss Essary inquired.

"P.W.A. workers and people on relief," the poller replied.

"Well, aren't they likely to be prejudiced in favor of the Administration?" the reported continued.

"Possibly," conceded the poller. "But I do what I'm told. I've just finished a questionnaire on convoys."

"Did most of your people know what convoys meant?" Miss Essary asked.

"Very few of them did. So I had to tell them," said the poller.

"Now, this is indeed interesting. How did you describe a convoy?" persisted Miss Essary.

(Take an easy chair and get comfortable now or this will throw you!)

"I merely said that convoys are ships going in pairs. One ship going with another," was the answer!

Miss Essary asked whether the poller had explained "that one of such ships is a warship with guns to be shot when necessary. And that shooting such guns is an act of war and will put this country and its people in great danger."

"No, indeed," the poller replied. "I didn't go into that. I didn't think they'd understand."

The poll taker must be congratulated for not wishing to burden these busy folk with such cluttering details.

Why, of course they favored convoys — ships travelling in pairs. Men and women travel in pairs; animals travel in pairs; policemen travel in pairs. They're happy. Why shouldn't poor, lonely ships travel in pairs?

Judging by this admitted system of recording sentiment, the Gallup comment on the opinion of those 15 people might read something like this:

"Americans in the lower income groups are unanimous in their approval of the use of convoys, an America Speaks survey completed last week reveals."

We don't say that the Gallup poll is handled exactly that way. We only say that it could be, in view of the information given Miss Essary by a Gallup poll taker.

* * *

Senator Wheeler told the Senate recently that he had received a letter from a Gallup employe in Montana, "a college graduate and very brilliant."

The young man said he had secured a position on Mr. Gallup's staff of interviewers out of curiosity and that his experience as a poll taker had convinced him that "the important questions concerning foreign policy are so framed that the person interviewed is almost forced to give an answer consistent with Roosevelt's policy."

After filing his official returns on one question the poll taker said he conducted an experiment for his own information.

"I exposed the question to people whose sympathies I positively knew to be with the policy of Lindbergh and Wheeler," the young man wrote.

"Before allowing them to answer I told them that one answer was Wheeler's policy, one was Lindbergh's and one was Roosevelt's, and admonished them to be very cautious with it. Unanimously, even with my warnings, they picked and approved Roosevelt's policy from the three choices.

"I explained the choices to them after they had answered and they all changed their answers."

* * *

Another interesting poll tidbit was provided in the House of Representatives by Congressman Louis Ludlow of Indiana.

A "national poll" unidentified by Ludlow had printed survey results revealing 42 per cent of the people in Indiana favoring convoys.

Everybody in Indiana, Ludlow asserted, knows that such a conclusion is absurd.

"I represent the capital district of the State," he continued, " a metropolitan area where it may reasonably be presumed that the sentiment in favor of convoys is stronger than in the rural districts. Nevertheless, a poll taken by the *Indianapolis News* — a real, honest-to-goodness poll in which over 14,000 ballots were cast — shows 92 per cent of our people against convoys, and 95 per cent against entering the war. On this basis I doubt whether, considering the State as a whole, more than 3 or 4 per cent of the people of Indiana favor convoys. Yet this national poll finds, right off the bat, that 42 per cent are in favor of it."

Asserting that such national polls are unreliable, Ludlow said that although he had been a Washington correspondent for 28 years and enjoyed a wide circle of friends and acquaintances: (1) he had never been questioned by a national poll; (2) no friend or acquaintances of his had ever been polled; (3) he had never heard of anyone who had ever been polled; (4) he had never heard of anyone who had ever heard of anyone who had ever been polled.

* * *

Last month the war-mongering magazine, *Life*, one of war-monger Henry Luce's publications, published an article purporting to show that in a typical middlewestern town, Neosho, Mo., sentiment for intervention in the war was overwhelming.

The America First Committee had every reason to believe this was a gross misrepresentation of the true situation, so it financed a thorough poll of Neosho by the newspapers of Springfield, Mo.

Ballots bearing the question "Do you favor United States entry into the European war?" were mailed to every adult listed in the Neosho city directory.

Where *Life* had allegedly found a large majority favoring intervention, the impartial poll of the Springfield papers disclosed 69.6 per cent opposed to intervention.

Of 3,153 ballots mailed out 99 were returned undelivered because of wrong addresses; 994 were returned with the question answered; 26 of those returned were "uncertain" in opinion; and others were not returned.

A voting return of one-third on any such poll is considered average and satisfactory, reported the Springfield *Sunday News and Leader*. And these returns showed 692 voting against intervention, with only 276 approving it.

Where, one is inclined to ask, is the overwhelming war sentiment *Life* purports to have found in the typical mid-west town of Neosho, Mo.?

The moral of the above facts would seem to be: Don't be misled by that supposedly large percentage of poll people favoring war measures, because those folks are terribly hard to find.

Britain on Top Since 1935

SPEAKING before the Des Moines Chamber of Commerce, Senator Guy M. Gillette of Iowa declared that *"every single statute that has gone on the books in America since 1935 has been in the interest and at the instigation of the British Foreign Office!"*

Senator Gillette claims that he has ample proof to substantiate that assertion.

It has been our contention that since the passage and the execution of the *Gold Nationalization Act* in 1934-5, we have been bending every effort to make pre-payment to Great Britain for World War No. 2.

What suckers we have been!

We bought gold mined at $11 an ounce at $35 an ounce and handed the profits to John Bull.

We concocted a so-called "good neighbor" policy for the sole benefit of John Bull.

We streamlined Congress into a yes-man organization for the benefit of John Bull.

We perpetuated a planned depression for the benefit of John Bull.

We seized homes, farms and properties of American citizens for the benefit of John Bull.

We kept one-third of our population ill-fed, poorly clothed and poorly housed for the benefit of John Bull.

We froze billions of dollars of gold at Fort Knox, Kentucky, for the benefit of John Bull.

We suffered and sorrowed and sacrificed for the benefit of John Bull.

It has been our constant assumption that the continuance of the undemocratic British Empire was more important than the prosperity of the American people.

Twenty years hence, we will be able to appraise at its true value the New Deal which transformed America from the land of the free into the land of a British colony.

Comment

Sabath Sows Seeds for Stalin's Soviet

ONE OF THE strangest phenomena in the House of Representatives is an alleged statesman named Adolph J. Sabath, a New Deal Congressman from Chicago.

According to his biography in *Who's Who in American Jewry* Mr. Sabath was born in Zaboria, Czechoslovakia, April 4, 1866, and came to Chicago in 1888. He was elected to the House in 1906 and has served there continuously since.

For a chap 75 years old he is extremely brave and talks a great fight in showing why the United States must take it upon itself to destroy Hitlerism.

Adolph has an abiding hate for his disreputable namesake who has been kicking up such a fuss in Europe; and of late, it seems, this hate has been intensified by Hitler's dastardly attack on lovable, peaceful Soviet Russia.

* * *

To appraise Mr. Sabath fairly, one must understand that he opposes brutal, undemocratic dictatorships everywhere — provided they are Nazi or Fascist. Joe Stalin's benevolent rule in Soviet Russia, of course, cannot be classified with the beastly regimes in Germany and Italy.

Now that Mr. Sabath's sentiments are clearly outlined, his recent appeal for aid to Russia should surprise no one.

"The Russians are not as atheistic and are far more democratic than the Nazis," explains Mr. Sabath.

Of course that may come as a revelation to those who had been so blinded by reason as to suspect that the murder of millions of Christians and the outlawing of Christianity in the Soviet had made the U.S.S.R. the most atheistic, anti-Christian nation in the world.

Indeed, that is not the case at all, according to Mr. Sabath. The regime which teaches that religion is "the opiate of the people" is not as atheistic as Nazi Germany, where a large majority of the population professes and practice Christianity!

Furthermore, the idea that Soviet Russia is as much a dictatorship as Nazi Germany is completely erroneous, the enlightened Mr. Sabath says. Communist Russia is far more democratic than Germany!

* * *

Way back in 1940, when Joe and Adolf were still whooping it up together — instead of against each other — Mr. Sabath knew that Joe wasn't such a bad fellow and he realized that Communism was in ill repute principally because of Nazi smears.

In a House speech reported in SOCIAL JUSTICE October 21, 1940, Mr. Sabath urged closer American ties with the Soviet, declaring, "Obviously the Fascist and capitalistic group of this country dislike the Russian form of government, but that should not be our national concern. Russia has always been friendly toward the United States, notably during the Civil War; and she does not need our assistance. She is and will be able to take care of herself; therefore, why should we not cultivate and promote friendly commercial relations with her?"

In view of the fact that he now urges all possible aid to Russia, Mr. Sabath perhaps might like to retract that portion of his statement that Russia "does not need our assistance. She is and will be able to take care of herself."

But surely he stands firmly behind his other 1940 observation that "there are critics of Soviet Russia and its policies. Investigation will reveal, I sincerely believe, that a whole lot of the criticism against Russia is due to Nazi and Fascist propaganda. That is one of the subtle tricks of the leaders of these 'isms.' They conduct all kinds of subversive activities and then try to escape detection and blame by pointing their fingers at the Communists."

In other words, says ardent New Dealer Sabath, Communism isn't half bad when you get to know it. It's just being maligned by the dirty Fascists.

How 'Democratic' Is Union Now?

UNION NOW, the scheme which would merge the United States with the British Empire, is reported to be gathering momentum and Anglophiles at a rapid rate.

To one unfamiliar with the immortal words of that profound student of human behavior, Mr. P. T. Barnum, such progress seems incredible, for nothing is quite so simple in the realm of argumentation than driving a spike of logic into the Union Now thesis and splitting the thing asunder.

Among others Mr. John B. Trevor, president of the American Coalition, has done so in a recent issue of *The New Republic*.

The revised, up-to-the-minute Union Now plan calls for a democratic union of all English-speaking peoples—one great big happy family of democracies.

When selling this hogwash to Americans, Mr. Clarence Streit, its chief publicist, points with pride to the proposed line-up showing the United States in voting control of the projected Union Congress. On the basis of one vote for every 5-million persons Uncle Sam would enjoy 27 votes compared with 23 for the British Empire.

But as Mr. Trevor points out, Streit fails to explain what happens to the 380-million British subjects who would not have representation under that set-up which is to be the epitome of democracy.

With the British Empire accorded 23 votes, only 115-million of the Empire's 495-million subjects would have a voice in the new super-government. Whereas, if the Union is to be truly democratic, as its proponents advertise it, the Empire would have 99 votes, compared with 27 for the United States.

Thus Mr. Streit seems tangled in his own hazy reasoning. On the one hand he sets out beautifully that "we hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal."

Then he argues that India's teeming millions cannot be admitted to the Union on an equal basis since they are "politically inexperienced." Only those members of the Union who are self-governing shall be given the right to vote in Union elections.

"If that," observes Mr. Trevor, is not a confession that the British Empire, as it is now constituted, is not a democracy and the plan of the proposed Union undemocratic, it is impossible to find words to properly characterize it."

However, the writer continues, "if the present subject races of the British Empire are given the right to vote, complete control of the Union would pass to the black, brown and yellow people held by Mr. Streit to be so politically undeveloped as not entitled to any determination of their own fate in his proposed Union."

A Fable That's Coming True

ONCE UPON a time there was a young, vigorous, freedom-loving nation which rebelled against foreign rule and established a government "of the people, for the people and by the people."

The nation grew and prospered until one day a few of the people thought it would be very lovely to invite the foreign nation that had been kicked out, to come back and help run the government that was established "of the people, for the people and by the people."

At length a group of those who wanted the foreign nation back formed a little club called "Union Now" and before long they had almost everybody believing that the freedom-loving people would be better off if they were reunited with the foreign nation. They said this was real democracy and since the freedom-loving people loved democracy they finally agreed to rejoin the foreign nation.

But soon they discovered they had been deceived, for they no longer had a government "of the people, for the people and by the people," but instead they were being ruled by the foreign nation their ancestors had kicked out many, many years before.

* * *

Just a fable, of course. But a fable that might be told 100 years from now to describe the rise and fall of American independence.

A very minute but significant instance revealing the British influence in Washington today was presented to the House of Representatives recently by Congressman Martin L. Sweeney of Ohio.

A group of Ohio business men, Sweeney reported, visited the Capital and sought priority rights on steel and power for a magnesium plant they intended to build in Nevada.

According to Sweeney the business men have a secret formula for processing magnesium, a metal vital to the nation's national defense program.

They were referred to John C. Jones, an Englishman employed by the Office of Production Management. Jones refused to grant power and steel priority rights for the proposed plant when the business men refused to divulge to him their secret formula.

"How do you like that?—an alien telling our citizens what they can or cannot do," Sweeney commented.

"Now this Englishman, Jones, is not a citizen of the United States—therefore he cannot take an oath of office. He is getting his per diem (remuneration) from the United States Government. In due time, I shall demand a thorough investigation. It looks to me as if the British have taken over the United States without firing a shot."

More of 'Justice Now!'

CHAPTERS II and III of "Justice Now!" the pamphlet quoted in last week's SOCIAL JUSTICE, are here presented.

They deal with social justice and the family and a living, family wage.

Chapter II

13. It is impossible to consider Social Justice apart from a consideration of the family.

14. The family is the primary society; it existed before the State and its rights come before those of the State. The State can never enjoy a stable existence unless the family is preserved. All social reform must be judged by the standard of whether it assists the family or not. If it assists it, it is good. If it handicaps it, it is bad.

15. Social Justice demands three things for the family, as stated by the Hierarchy of Australia in the declaration of 1940.

(a) Children are to enjoy their father's guidance and their mother's care. It is a perilous policy for the state to allow those economic circumstances to continue which deprive children of this care and guidance because the mother is forced to work to increase the family income.

(b) The child has the right to physical, intellectual, moral and religious development. The obligation for providing this rests on the parents.

Where the parents cannot undertake in full detail the task of educating their children, they may delegate teachers to do so. The teacher, however, always remains the agent of the parent, and neither the teacher, nor an association of teachers, nor the State can claim rights which run counter to those of the parents.

In matters of education, the State has the duties and rights of protection and control. The State may take measures to ensure that all its citizens receive an adequate education. It should do this by supporting, regulating and supplementing private initiative. It should not become a monopolist.

(c) The breadwinner has the right to receive a Family Wage, so that the security and independence of human life may be ensured.

* * *

Chapter III

It is necessary that three guiding principles of Christian social doctrine with regard to the Family Wage should be stated clearly at the beginning —

16. THE WORKER IS ENTITLED IN JUSTICE TO THE FAMILY WAGE. In his last great Encyclical on the social question, Pius XI declared that "Social Justice cannot be said to have been satisfied as long as working men are denied a salary that will enable them to secure proper sustenance for themselves and for their families."

17. In the same Encyclical the late Pope stressed that it was Justice and not Charity which demanded that workers be paid a Family Wage. In paying the Family Wage, the employer is giving to the workers money which justly belongs to them; he is not simply being generous with his own money. In withholding the Family Wage, when he can afford to pay it, he is retaining money which belongs to someone else. That is theft.

18. "From this it follows," wrote Pius XI, "that a 'charity' which deprives the working-man of the salary to which he has a strict title in justice, is not charity at all, but only its empty name and hollow semblance. The wage-earner is not to receive as alms what is his due in justice. And let no one attempt with trifling charitable donations to exempt himself from the great duties imposed by justice."

19. THE PAYMENT OF THE FAMILY WAGE IS A FIRST CHARGE ON INDUSTRY. After the employer has obtained a Family Wage for himself the worker is entitled to the payment of a Family Wage — that is a sufficient wage to ensure a proper livelihood for himself and his family — before any profits accrue to the employer.

20. THE PAYMENT OF A FAMILY WAGE IS A CHARGE ON THE INDUSTRY RATHER THAN THE STATE. It is not just to demand wages so high that an employer cannot pay them without ruin. But at the same time, if the business makes smaller profits on account of bad management, want to enterprise, or out-of-date methods, this is not a just reason for reducing the worker's wages below the family level. Neither is it just for industry to pass its responsibility to pay the Family Wage on to the State, unless it is quite impossible for industry to bear this responsibility.

21. If such an industry, despite the fact that it finds it impossible to pay the Family Wage to workers, must be kept in existence by reason of national policy, then there is obviously a duty on the State to make up the difference between the wages which the industry can afford to pay and the Family Wage which the workers in the industry are entitled to in justice.

A Letter to Father Coughlin

OF THE many thousands of letters which came to our desk, commenting on Father Coughlin's Silver Jubilee, we reprint one addressed directly to Father Coughlin, a copy of which was mailed to us by the sender, Hugh McKinnon.

Mr. McKinnon is associated with higher education in the City of Detroit. He is a parishioner of the Shrine parish and, as such, reflects the mind of Father Coughlin's flock.

He said:

Dear Father Coughlin:

The celebration of your Silver Jubilee was most impressive. To us who were gathered at the Shrine, it was the occasion of thanksgiving to God for a pastor who has been the faithful guardian of our spiritual and temporal welfare in an exceptional manner.

In an era whose characteristic note has been hypocrisy and greed, you championed truth-telling as oposed to hypocrisy, and social-justice and charity as opposed to greed. You combined Truth and Virtue in behalf of Peace. We who have been silent witnesses can testify to these things.

Never has your counsel to us been stupid or cowardly or selfish. Your voice has been a veritable scourge of forces that would bring about the undoing of our lives, our liberty and our little happiness. You have been the faithful guardian of our temporal welfare. We thank our Heavenly Father, in the name of His Divine Son, for a heroic priest.

You have provided us with exceptional and unusual opportunities for practicing our religion and giving praise to God; you have conducted triduums and novenas and special devotions, never sparing yourself or shifting the work on others.

Where else, than at the Shrine, is the liturgy of the Church for feast days so completely and beautifully performed?

Sunday after Sunday, you have read the Mass for your parishioners at an hour convenient for them and their children, and unfolded the Gospel to them as one filled with the Holy Spirit. Never have your parishioners been deprived of your best efforts at their Mass, in behalf of crowds of visitors at later Masses.

You have provided the children with a modern school and the best instruction obtainable. You have sought out our poor and neglected. You have comforted them and educated their children. Needy missionaries have beaten a path to your door.

It is with puzzled admiration that we have observed you not only forgive injuries but return good for evil. You have taught us humility and obedience by unparalleled example in our time. You have been the faithful guardian of our spiritual welfare. We thank our Heavenly Father for our virtuous pastor.

The world does not know you as we know you. To the world, you are the Voice from Royal Oak; a Voice of indomitable force and temper, caught between the Catholic Church and Judaism, between International Capitalism and Atheistic Communism, between Capital and Labor, between Power Politics and Religion, between Americanism and Ecclesiasticism.

All the forces that oppose you are on the grandest scale. They press on your individual soul, and you are silenced. You have been faithful to your priestly vow of obedience.

We thank our Father in Heaven, in Jesus' name, for sending you to us, and we thank you for your coming. We ask our Father in Heaven to speed the day when Justice and Faith will triumph, to speed the day when you can preach according to the American tradition of human freedom, without let or hindrance.

God bless you, Father Coughlin, is the prayer of your devoted parishioners on the occasion of your Silver Jubilee to the Priesthood and the fifteenth anniversary of your coming in our midst.

Sincerely yours,
Hugh McKinnon.

The Invisible Network

THE SAME national radio network which airs President Roosevelt's "Four Freedom" speeches denies the exercise of one of these freedoms — freedom of speech — to native Americans.

A month ago a nation-wide broadcast on Soviet Russia, reportedly to be paid for by Henry Ford, was arranged with one of the national broadcasting systems.

The speakers were to have been Eugene Lyons, Editor of the *American Mercury;* Jan Valtin, author of "Out of the Night," an expose of both Communists and Nazis; and Freda Utley, wife of a Russian Communist who was liquidated by Stalin.

Then, the network mysteriously cancelled the broadcast.

The reason? One guess is that a broadcast by such notorious anti-Stalinists might incur the displeasure of Roosevelt's newly proclaimed ally — Bolshevist Russia.

NATIONAL WEEKLY
Social Justice
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

To Reaffirm Our Stand

RECENTLY President Roosevelt issued a statement that "As the birthday of American independence draws near it is altogether fitting that we should re-dedicate ourselves to defend and perpetuate those inalienable rights which found true expression in the immortal declaration. Those words never had a deeper or more solemn meaning for America than they have in this hour of anxiety and peril."

Cassandra-like, SOCIAL JUSTICE and Father Coughlin predicted — three years ago — that this country was taking an inevitable step toward war. The occasion was associated with the revision of the Neutrality Act.

Then the President solemnly promised American fathers and mothers that he would not send their sons to fight on foreign soil.

Then politicians scoffed at the prospect of our being sucked into Europe's death struggle.

As matters stand today, we are engaged in an undeclared war. Our military and naval forces are operating outside the western hemisphere.

The worst is yet to come.

In all events, we add our confirmation to the words of Mr. Roosevelt expressed above.

But — ninety-five per cent of our citizenry abhor war and are reluctant to become engaged abroad.

Is it too late to turn our attention to the needs at home?

Assuredly, we need national defense as represented by weapons, warships, airplanes and equipment.

More than that, we need a revival of the spirit which made us great.

Bring God back into our public assemblies, our schools, our industries and institutions.

Bring God back into our homes and family relations.

Bring God back to our individual hearts and minds.

Material defense without moral defense is a contradiction.

Material defense without national unity is a deception.

If high and low clergymen can leave their fields of religious operations, attempting to plow furrows in the fields of politics by supporting an all-aid-for-Britain policy, it is just as proper for high and low politicians — including Mr. Roosevelt — to leave the field of politics and enter the field of religion by campaigning for a policy of all aid to God.

We suggest, therefore, to our President to appeal to our people to revive the religious practices of their forebears.

The "rights" which he mentions in his words quoted above are unprotectable if the people persist in abandoning God.

The independence which he refers to will melt into slavery unless God guardeth the city.

It is not so important to make the world safe for democracy as it is to make the world safe for God.

It is not so important to campaign for human rights as it is to campaign for God's rights.

The American system of life is no better than any other system of life unless God and His justice dominate the system.

$5,000 Challenge to Pegler: Prove Error in 'An Answer to Father Coughlin's Critics'